Search for abbreviated months

Castle 57

Inventories in text p. 10 in Refs ??

MHC - Debt Books 1766

Oxon Hill History

through Pat G 12/4/85 - p. 164 MHR MS 5

to Tom 12/4/85

(Note: the Draft Report to MD will be 1½ spaced in final production.)

* When Tom finished and has settled any question between him & Pat, return to Bruce B. ASAP. to run out final.

OUTLINE

CHAPTER 1: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A. METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES

Methodology

Sources

1. Introduction
2. Archival Sources
3. Primary Printed Sources
4. Secondary Sources: General Works
5. Secondary Sources: Previous Research on Oxon Hill Manor
6. Secondary Sources: The Colonial Period
7. Secondary Sources: The National Period
8. Secondary Sources: The South

B. COLONIAL MARYLAND

Settlement

The Colonial Tobacco Economy

The Colonial Social Order

1. Demographic Trends
2. The Colonial Social Structure
3. Colonial Prince George's County

Oxon Hill Manor in Colonial Maryland

1. Ownership and Status, 1674-1774

2. Land Use and Labor Patterns, 1674-1793

C. MARYLAND SINCE THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Introduction

Decline and Adjustment, 1783-1860

1. Agriculture

2. Slavery

3. Free Blacks

4. Antebellum Prince George's County

   a. Agriculture
   b. Slavery, Wealthholding and Free Blacks

5. Summary

Agricultural Diversification and Farm Tenancy, 1860-1900

1. General Trends in Maryland and the South

2. Trends in Prince George's County and in Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts, 1850-1880

   a. Prince George's County
   b. Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts

3. Summary

Oxon Hill Manor Since the American Revolution

1. Introduction
2. The Walter Dulany Addison Years, 1793-1810
3. The Thomas and Zachariah Berry Years, 1810-1860
4. The Thomas E. Berry Years, 1860-1888
5. Speculation and the New Oxon Hill Manor, 1888-1970
6. Summary

Chain of Title

A. METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES

Methodology

Research for this report on the history of Oxon Hill Manor has focused on three principal themes: ownership patterns, land-use trends, and labor systems. A good deal of effort has also been made to assess the evolution of the estate within the context of trends within Prince George's County, Maryland and the South. Evaluating specific historical changes in relation to such larger patterns serves a dual purpose. First, it allows the analysis to proceed within a more self-censoring explanatory framework by highlighting key similarities and differences between local and regional trends. Second, it places the analysis within the historiography of the topic under discussion, thereby enhancing the value of the report as a unique contribution to both the history of Maryland and of the South.

Historical documentation on Oxon Hill Manor is uneven both in quantity and in quality. As the research unfolded it became apparent that the few available private papers would not be of much value and that the history of the site would have to be reconstructed largely from public records. The need to work with public documents pushed the research

in certain directions, but did not obstruct the analysis of ownership, land use, and labor as the key historical themes of the study. As will be seen later, the opportunity to thoroughly explore such materials as tax assessments and census data greatly enhanced the depth of analysis of certain points.

The theme of ownership of Oxon Hill Manor, which includes close examination of the social, economic, and political role of the manor's proprietors, was more easily studied in the eighteenth century than in the Nineteenth. Various qualitative sources, augmented by several estate inventories, offered a fairly clear picture of the manor during the Addison family years from the 1720s to 1810. A complete understanding of nineteenth century ownership was hindered somewhat by the fact that the manor was occupied by the son of the owner from 1812 to 1845, by the lack of estate inventories, and by not altogether clear occupancy patterns by the owner or the owner's sons and by various tenants from the mid 1850s until the 1880s. After 1888 the estate changed hands frequently, both before and after the fire that destroyed the manor house in 1895.

Land use, a second theme of this report, is more thoroughly understood in the nineteenth century. While various sources reveal something of eighteenth century patterns, the agricultural population and slave censuses of

the nineteenth century offer more precise data. The details of land use of the site are not usually available, but we can establish the general land use patterns at Oxon Hill Manor by examining appropriate census materials for both owners and tenants. Again, the absence of private papers which might have provided maps or descriptions of site use was a limiting factor.

Labor patterns are also best understood for the site in the nineteenth century, owing mainly to the discovery of a court record which included information on Oxon Hill Manor tenants in the 1870s and 1880s. Although the census did not list tenants separately before 1880, a great deal was learned about labor and agricultural practices at the site during this latter period. Pre-Civil War details on labor patterns are not precise in that we do not have exact data on crops and levels of production. We do have, however, considerable documentation on the numbers of slaves present and, in some cases for the eighteenth century, of their distribution around the estate. Primary source research and obvious secondary sources also permit in-depth comparison of slaveholding at Oxon Hill with regular state and southern trends. Discussion of slaveholding also affords the opportunity to measure the social and economic status of the owners or occupants of Oxon Hill Manor.

To generalize about the themes of ownership, land use

and labor patterns at Oxon Hill Manor, it is evident that economic and social life in the site area tended to follow dominant historical trends of the agricultural South: from heavy dependence on a single crop (tobacco) employing slave labor toward greater diversification and widespread use of tenant labor. Oxon Hill's agricultural practices and labor arrangements, however, were also conditioned strongly by the proximity of major urban centers -- Washington, D.C. and Baltimore. Census analysis reveals a clear and marked shift toward market gardening and orchards, as well as various changes which may have begun before the Civil War. The impact of nearby urban centers was especially strong in Prince George's County, for reasons to be discussed later.

Sources

1. Introduction.

This section examines the contributions of the most important sources used in this study. Before looking at specific sources, however, a few generalizations can be made about the relative strengths and weaknesses of Maryland historiography. First, the overwhelming bulk of high-quality research done on colonial Maryland has been done mainly by young historians working since the late 1960s

with the "new social history" method. With the notable exception of the city of Baltimore, the newer methods in economic and social history have not been applied to post-revolutionary Maryland, although a variety of sound political studies of both colonial and national period Maryland were of limited value to this report.

Second, even general treatments of Maryland history which utilize modern methods and up-to-date information are rare. Development of a clear understanding of the economic and social history of nineteenth century Maryland was especially limited by this weakness. Third, Prince George's county, the county in which Oxon Hill is located, has not benefited from a sound or comprehensive historical treatment. County-level studies have been conducted with little or no attention to economic or social patterns, focusing more on the history of the courthouse than on the lives of residents of the county. Some valuable general research has been done by various authors.

Fourth, Maryland's history is extremely accessible for primary research, due mainly to the existence of several well-developed repositories. Most important to this study were materials located at the Maryland Hall of Records in Annapolis. Among the most valuable records consulted were the estate inventories, land records, court cases, plats, and tax assessments. Another important Annapolis

repository, the Maryland State Law Library, provided most of the nineteenth century manuscript census data, along with a variety of additional secondary sources. The Enoch Pratt Library in Baltimore was the most useful repository for cartographic information, although the library also offered many other secondary materials. The Maryland Historical Society library in Baltimore holds the Addison family papers along with other genealogical records and secondary sources. The Prince George's County courthouse in Upper Marlboro contains the land records for the county, although these were more efficiently utilized at the Hall of Records. The vitally important Chancery Court Case (#1208) dealing with the insanity hearings of the last Oxon Hill Manor owner, Thomas E. Berry, is housed at the courthouse. Also useful was the Maryland collection of the University of Maryland, College Park. The collection was especially valuable as a source of theses and dissertations. The largest repositories, the Library of Congress and the National Archives, were the least useful for this study, as neither archive offered significant documentation not found elsewhere. An 1840 Maryland census at the National Archives was helpful.

Special mention should be made of a number of individuals whose cooperation made this research both more pleasant and more thorough. The initial research conducted

by Silas Hurry at the Maryland Geological Survey and by his assistant, Lori Frye, was very helpful. Their assistance and cooperation are greatly appreciated. Harriet "Quinta" Castle, a descendant of the Addison family allowed us to consult her family papers. While the papers did not offer much material not previously used by other authors, including her father, Guy Castle, her cooperation is also appreciated.

2. Archival Sources

Without attempting to evaluate the quality of all archives utilized, a brief commentary on the most important sources will be useful. The Addison family papers in the manuscript collection of the Maryland Historical Society proved to be of little value. Most of the collection deals with the family in the nineteenth century, after the sale of Oxon Hill Manor to the Berry family, and the little remaining material of value has been presented in the works of Murray (1895) and Castle (1957). The papers held by Harriet Castle, an Addison descendent living near Oxon Hill, Maryland, are also overwhelmingly from the nineteenth century, and deal mostly with the related Bayne and Leitch families. Ms. Castle's father drew his information on the pre-1810 Addisons from these and other public documents.

~~located~~ no other Addison family papers, nor ~~did I find~~ were located any private papers relating to the Berry family. Unlike public records, the private papers of Maryland's prominent planters have not survived in any abundance (Land, 1967, pp. 470; Land, 1969, pp. 69; Marks, 1979, p. 174).

Among the most useful archival sources were inventories, accounts against deceased estates, land records (deeds), chancery papers, wills, marriage licenses, plats, census records, and tax assessments. Inventories list the personal property, including loans and debts, of individuals at the time of death. These documents describe the property of the deceased in great detail, listing all the items in individual rooms of their homes and in all outbuildings or other dependencies. They list the number of slaves at various locations, such as on separate quarters or plantations, as well all tools, livestock, and crops on hand. Inventories for Addison owners from 1727, 1765, and 1775 were especially helpful. The inventory for Zachariah Berry in 1845 was of no use, however, since Berry was not residing at Oxon Hill. The 1856 inventory of his son, the owner of Oxon Hill Manor at that time, contained only minimal ~~information, for reasons I have been unable to determine.~~ The associated "accounts against deceased estates" provide auxiliary details regarding the settlements of estates.

Land records provided the essential data on the pattern

of ownership of the estate. They also mentioned sales of parts of the original manor and offered some data on leasing. Careful examination of these records revealed that they excluded some relevant land transactions at Oxon Hill Manor, perhaps because they were not recorded. References to survey plats from 1809 by George Fenwick and from 1879 by William P. Latimer served only to frustrate research; neither plat was located, despite diligent searching.

Chancery records were scarce, but an invaluable civil case from the 1780s in which the minor, Walter Dulany Addison, sued his stepfather and mother for abusing his estate, contained extremely helpful information regarding the organization of the property. An accompanying plat, dated 1785, revealed some of the uses of the main lands and outlined the portion awarded his mother as a dower. The 1870s and 1880s case, dealing with insanity proceedings against Thomas E. Berry, included personal, financial, land use, tenancy, and other information. Both cases were extremely helpful in filling the vacuum left by the paucity of private papers.

Wills and management records assisted in filling genealogical gaps, and wills also offered important data on the inheritance of land. Among the plats not found in other records, the most significant was the 1767 "resurvey" of the original 3,663-acre estate.

Census records were one of the most crucial forms of documentation for this study. Although I was able at times to utilize research already performed by other scholars, almost all of the analysis of censuses after 1790 was done by me. The nineteenth century in Maryland has not yet been studied in anything approaching the depth of research afforded the colonial period. Even the all-important population, slave, and agricultural censuses from 1850 to 1880 have been barely touched. Unlike areas of the Cotton South, where some excellent studies of agriculture have been done, rural Maryland both before and after the Civil War remains an historigraphical wasteland. Because of this, and also because of the absence of private papers, I elected to analyze the nineteenth century census material in depth. Given the lack of site-specific maps or descriptions, the next best approach was to analyze the agricultural production of both owners and identifiable tenants within the context of local, regional, state, and Southern agriculture.

A final archival source absolutely essential to this report was the tax assessment collection of the Hall of Records in Annapolis. Tax assessments include data on the name, size, and value of the landholdings of all county residents -- their real property -- as well as documentation on the value of their personal property -- slaves, household

furniture, plate, gold and silver watches, and livestock. Although the tax assessments for Prince George's County are quite complete from 1790 to 1850, they have several gaps from 1850 to 1888. No assessments from the 1850s have survived. The special value of the tax assessments was in their delineation of the occupants of particular tracts of land. One of their weaknesses is that they do not always distinguish owners from occupants, as in the case of Thomas Berry. Berry occupied but did not own Oxon Hill Manor from 1812 to 1845, but the assessments do not indicate this fact. Another consideration when working with the assessments is that they were not completed every year. Changes which occurred in a given year may not have been recorded immediately.

12/6/85 Bruce-you left off here

3. Primary Printed Sources

Among primary printed sources, the most useful single source was the Reminiscences of the Reverend Jonathan Boucher (1925). An Addison relative by marriage in the late eighteenth century, Boucher's feisty and often tactless commentary provided valuable personal information on various members of the Addison family in the years just before the American Revolution. Other printed sources of some value were the Maryland Directories of the late nineteenth century

(1878, 1880, 1882, 1887), and the offerings by Fisher (1852), Higgins (1867) and Johns Hopkins University (1893). All of these sources offered statistical data on Prince George's County agriculture, and the directories added material on the occupations of certain named individuals in the Oxon Hill area (1727-1734, 1745-1789). The American Farmer (1819-1897) and The Planters' Advocate (1851-1861) were of little use, even though the Maryland Gazette has been thoroughly indexed. ~~I did not consult other relevant newspapers because none were indexed and the time needed for such research would have been prohibitive.~~ Travelers' accounts provided almost nothing of value to this report. The bibliography does not include most of the travelers' accounts examined ~~in my research~~.

4. Secondary Sources: General Works

Aubrey C. Land, one of Maryland's foremost historians, has written the most useful general study of colonial Maryland (1981). Based on more up-to-date research, it greatly supercedes the older works of such scholars as McSherry (1849) and Scharf (1879). The edited general history of Maryland by Walsh and Fox (1974) includes a chapter on the colonial period by Land. Middleton's study of the Colonial Chesapeake (1953), although more

specialized, was of some value in providing an orientation to the overwhelming importance of Maryland's tobacco industry in the colonial period. Also of assistance for general colonial history were works by Gutheim (1949), Reps (1972), Tilp (1978) and Wilstach (1920 and 1931). Gutheim and Wilstach's works are general histories covering both colonial and national periods. Tilp focuses on maritime history and reports on the development of urban areas along the river. None of these sources contained significant data on the Oxon Hill Manor estate itself.

The history of Maryland since independence has not yet received modern general historical treatment. For general trends the researcher must rely on the older studies or on the edited volume by Walsh and Fox. While helpful, the Walsh and Fox study does not reflect much of current research. In any case, few areas outside the City of Baltimore have been studied in any depth.

5. Secondary Sources: Previous Research on Oxon Hill Manor

In 1957 Guy Castle, an Addison family descendant, published a newspaper article and an accompanying photograph of the old manor house. Castle's article did not cover the family in any depth, but it did offer a general outline of the ownership of Oxon Hill Manor and of the social status of

the Addisons in the eighteenth century. In 1974 Barry Mackintosh prepared a report for the National Park Service on the new Oxon Hill Manor built near the old manor house site by Sumner Welles in 1929. His report contained some information on the old Oxon Hill Manor and was most useful for its partial chain of title of the old estate. Silas Hurry's 1984 report for the Maryland Geological Survey built on Mackintosh's information by exploring the history of the old Oxon Hill Manor in some depth. Hurry turned up a variety of valuable documents and conducted a general analysis of three estate inventories from the eighteenth century. Owing to lack of time and other research difficulties, the report had only minimal information on the estate in the Nineteenth Century.

6. Secondary Sources: The Colonial Period

Among the various specialized studies of colonial Maryland, studies by Clemens (1980), Craven (1965), Earle (1975), Kulikoff (1976), Land (1965, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1972), Gloria Main (1982), Menard (1973, 1975, 1977, 1980), Papenfuse (1972, 1975), Skaggs (1973), and Stiverson (1977a, 1977b) stand out. Most of these works are representative of the newer studies on social and economic history that employ statistical and demographic data. Clemens deals with the

agricultural changes of the eighteenth century eastern shore of Maryland, Earle with All Hallows Parish in Anne Arundel County on the Western Shore, Main and Menard with more general social, economic, and demographic trends in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, and Skaggs with land ownership patterns in the eighteenth century. Stiverson's work is an important contribution to our understanding of colonial tenancy, even though his study deals with tenants on Lord Baltimore's private manors rather than those on the privately owned plantations. Kulikoff's studies, especially his dissertation, is the single most significant contribution to the history of colonial Prince George's County, despite its somewhat narrow focus on slave life and slaveholding patterns. The works of Land and Papenfuse offer more general treatments of plantation society and are especially important in evaluating the social and economic structure of colonial agriculture.

Perhaps the single most influential study of Maryland history is Avery O. Craven's Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland (1965). While no longer accepted completely by either Maryland or Virginia scholars, Craven's focus on soil exhaustion as the key factor in the agricultural evolution of the Maryland and Virginia Tidewaters has become the touchstone of virtually all agriculturally oriented histories.

Apart from Kulikoff's excellent research, Prince George's County has not received the attention of modern scholars. The works of Bowie (1975), Heinton (1972), Van Horn (1976) and Watson (1962) tend to be superficial, although they are useful in a general introductory sense. Bowie and Heinton offer valuable genealogical data on the Addison and Berry families in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. McGrath (1950) also presents useful genealogical information, while Land (1968) and Zimmer (1978) provide in-depth treatments of two eighteenth century Addison family relatives, the Dulanys and the Reverend Jonathan Boucher.

7. Secondary Sources: The National Period

The history of Maryland since the American Revolution has not received the same amount of modern treatment as has been applied to the colonial years. Although the city of Baltimore has received considerable attention in such works as Browne (1980) and in numerous articles of the Maryland Historical Magazine, our understanding of modern Maryland must rely on scattered sources of uneven quality. The most useful general source is Walsh and Fox's edited study (1974), a work which treats the general outlines of nineteenth century Maryland's politics, economy, society, and culture. Otherwise, the researcher is forced to rely on

the less valuable older general histories by McSherry (1949) and Scharf (1879), among others.

The history of Prince George's County in the nineteenth century has been boosted by a brief but insightful article by McCauley (1977), and by the same author's master's thesis (1973). Taken together, these studies examine general trends in Prince George's County agriculture from 1840 until 1880. McCauley is particularly interested in explaining the influence of nearby urban centers on Prince George's County agriculture patterns. Both works were of some assistance in the analysis of Prince George's County agriculture in the mid-nineteenth century. Less helpful because of their extreme institutional orientation were Vivian Wiser's doctoral dissertation (1963) and her article on ante bellum agricultural reform (1969). Both examine the development of agricultural societies and publications rather than the actual changes in Maryland's agricultural practices on the farm and plantation, and neither focus on any particular region of Maryland. A brief and sometimes inaccurate study of Suitland, Prince George's County, by Norton (1976) was of some use.

The most helpful source on Oxon Hill Manor itself was Elizabeth Hesselius Murray's <u>One Hundred Years Ago - The Life and Times of Walter Dulany Addison, 1769-1848</u> (1895). A descendant of the Addison family, Murray had access to

private papers no longer available to either the family or the researcher. Her research on the last Addison owner of Oxon Hill Manor, the Reverend Walter Dulany Addison, provided several details useful to our understanding of the operation of the estate from 1790 to 1810. The work's genealogical orientation limited its value for economic or more general social themes. My examination of the Addison family papers, both of the Maryland Historical Society and in the possession of Harriet Castle, revealed that Murray and Guy Castle had fully used all of this currently available documentation on Oxon Hill Manor. Murray's lack of attention to the spatial organization of Oxon Hill Manor suggests that she probably had no plats, drawings or descriptions of the estate in her possession, even in 1895.

Works dealing with the impact of the War of 1812 in Maryland, including those of Gleig (1836) and Marine (1913), were of no value. More surprising was the lack of helpful data in studies of the Civil War in Maryland. Civil War histories by Duncan (1962), Evitts (1974), Manakee (1961), Murfin (1965) and Toomey (1983) revealed no significant information about the Oxon Hill Manor area, largely because little activity took place in the region during the war years. Maryland was almost immediately occupied by Union troops, and most of the battles took place to the north of Washington D.C., at Antietam and Gettysburg.

One of Maryland's most unusual nineteenth century social trends was the rapid growth of the free black population after the American Revolution. Since Walter Dulany Addison elected to free his own slaves around 1800, it was decided to investigate sources which might have dealt either with Addison specifically or with the phenomenon more generally. Studies of blacks by Berlin (1974), Douchett (1889), Brown (1972), Callicott (1969), Carroll (1961), Franklin (1943), Genovese (1974), Jackson (1942), Russell (1913), Wagandt (1864) and Wright (1921) are among the Maryland comparative studies consulted. In general, these studies provided a close picture of free black life in the ante-bellum period, but a less than satisfactory assessment of the trend toward manumitting = freeing slaves after the American Revolution. While ~~religious~~ conscience and the post-Revolutionary influence for equality and liberty are frequently mentioned, little attention is given to such economic factors as the decline in the tobacco economy, and almost no effort has been made to systematically examine the phenomenon by employing vigorous qualitative or quantitative techniques.

8. Secondary Sources: The South

Placing the economic and social history of Oxon Hill

Manor into its proper historical context necessitated research into general and comparative studies of Southern history. For general social trends in the colonial period the works of Bridenbaugh (1952) and Main (1965) were useful, especially in conjunction with the social histories of Maryland by Land, Papenfuse, Kulikoff, and others. Phillips (1929) and Schlebecker (1975) were also helpful on trends in agricultural/social history. The most valuable single source on antebellum agriculture was Lewis Cecil Gray's classic, History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860 (1941). Although outdated in many respects, Gray's work still remains not only a model of historical scholarship but also a veritable treasure-house of information on southern agricultural practices and trends. Like Craven's work, Soil Exhaustion, Gray's History of Agriculture appears as a point of departure for studying Southern agriculture.

As an outgrowth of long-standing interest in the Civil War and slavery and of periodic concern for the roots of black poverty, the topic of agricultural trends since 1860 has received considerable attention from historians. Although much of the research since the 1970s is very thorough and methodologically sophisticated, it still does not compare favorably in quantity or quality with the research which has been conducted on antebellum slavery.

These inadequacies notwithstanding, a number of scholars have turned their attention to the impact of the Civil War on antebellum agricultural and labor patterns. Of particular interest has been the development of tenant labor systems to replace the old plantation and slave complex. Since one of the principal themes of this report is the organization and development of agricultural labor at Oxon Hill Manor in the nineteenth century, a brief evaluation of some of the literature seems appropriate.

Farm tenancy and labor patterns received little systematic attention from historians before the 1930s. Although tenancy expanded rapidly after the Civil War, it was not until 1880 that the census began to separate tenants and it was not until Goldenweiser and Truesdell (1924) examined tenancy ~~in 1924~~ that the issue received close attention. Goldenweiser and Truesdell, along with various sociologists, agricultural economists, and Farm Security Administration photographers in the 1930s worked out of feelings of concern for the apparently continuous association between tenancy and rural poverty from the late nineteenth century. Historians Mendenhall (1927) and Cox (1944) were the first scholars to address the issue on concrete historical terms, with Cox calling for more systematic research into the actual historical condition of tenancy (Garrow & Associates, 1984).

Brockington et al. 1985

Slow to follow Cox's lead, historians did not fully address the tenancy issue until the 1970s. Armed with a variety of methodological tools, notably classical economic theory, various Marxist approaches, and cliometric analysis, historians of Southern agricultural since the 1970s have engaged in an often heated debate over the origins, nature, and historical impact of Southern tenancy. As Harold Woodman (1977) points out in his overview of part of this debate, all of these historians take the persistence of southern poverty as their point of departure. In one way or another, they attempt to explain why the emancipation of the slaves did not lead to the kind of yeoman farmer arrangements characteristic of areas outside the South and why the southern economy seemed to lag so far behind the rest of the nation.

From all of the studies it is evident that recently freed blacks did not receive land after the Civil War. Rather, planters attempted to renew the slave gang labor system of the antebellum plantations and to place individuals and groups of blacks under labor contracts. Blacks refused to accept labor contracts, choosing instead to flee to the North, to remain idle, or to insist upon some form of access to land. Within two or three years after the war various forms of tenancy had begun replacing labor contracts. The dominant form of tenancy was share-cropping,

whereby the tenant received a part of the crop he produced in return for his labor. Some tenants paid fixed money rents, and a wide and complex variety of arrangements developed between the money rental and share-cropping systems. Historians studying tenancy and post-bellum agriculture are divided along lines too complex to be adequately addressed here. To generalize, the works of DeCanio (1975), Higgs (1977), Reid (1973) and Shlomowitz (1979) tend to deny the impact of non-market forces, such as racism, on the development of post bellum labor arrangements. Others, notably Mandle (1978), Ransom and Sutch (1977), Wiener (1978, 1979) and Woodman (1977) emphasize the role of non-market factors, pointing out that planters, the Freedman's Bureau, merchants, the Ku Klux Klan, and others obstructed, often with force, the operation of the "free market" in post-Civil War labor arrangements. Whatever the value of their conclusions, the works of the latter group of historians are much better grounded in empirical historical research. If nothing else, they ask the appropriate questions about the actual unfolding of events, rather than speculating upon what should have occurred. Wiener (1978), for example, examines the actual persistence of the antebellum planter elite in Alabama after the Civil War. Working from census and other data, he concludes that the Civil War destroyed neither the planter

elite nor its landholding base, even if this group no longer owned slaves. Ransom and Sutch and Mandle pay close attention to the relationship between market and non-market forces on labor systems. While Mandle offers a well-developed theoretical statement on the need to address non-market influences, Ransom and Sutch use classical economic theory to measure such non-market aspects of post-bellum economic life as the refusal of freed blacks to work as hard as under slavery and the impact of merchant and planter monopolistic control of credit.

The implications of these historical studies of post Civil War agriculture for our understanding of Oxon Hill Manor derive more from the questions raised than the conclusions drawn. Given the time limitation for this report, moreover, it would not be possible to adequately research most of the issues raised. Although McCauley addresses some of these questions in his study of Prince George's County, the key problem of determining precise patterns of the region and subregional level remains. The analysis in this report of Maryland, Prince George's County and of Spalding and Oxon Hill district's agriculture in the nineteenth century, however, does attempt to evaluate and explain the effects of the Civil War and other nineteenth century changes.

Most of the historical questions raised by historians

of nineteenth century agriculture and labor patterns in the south have not been explored by historians of Maryland. The most useful study, which deals only with antebellum agriculture, is an examination of St. Mary's County, Maryland, by Marks (1979). Like Kulikoff and other historians employing quantitative data, Marks analyzes the social evolution of the county by examining the actual distribution of wealth --land, slaves, housing, etc. -- from 1790 to 1840. No other study of post Revolutionary Maryland compares to Marks' level of analysis, placing it more comfortably within the recent histories of colonial Maryland. Two studies of nineteenth century Virginia, however, offer information of comparative value: Schlotterbeck (1980) and Shifflett (1982). Both authors deal with Virginia counties in the nineteenth century, Schlotterbeck with Louisa County from 1860 to 1900. Both are useful as comparative studies, their value being limited to some extent by the fact that they treat Piedmont counties rather than the Tidewater counties which are more comparable to Oxon Hill Manor's historical environment.

B. COLONIAL MARYLAND

Settlement

When Colonel John Addison, the founder of what would come to be known as Oxon Hill Manor, stepped ashore in Maryland for the first time in 1674, he was not among the earliest arrivals in colonial Maryland. But he and his heirs would rise quickly in wealth, status, and political influence to join the ranks of Maryland's first families. Like most of these families, the Addisons would rise to prominence by virtue of their systematic acquisition of land and its effective exploitation by growing tobacco with slave labor.

Maryland was settled after 1634 largely by indentured servants. Between 1634 and 1681, approximately seventy percent of all immigrants were servants, and almost all of them--as well as the free immigrants--were young, white males (Mitchell and Mullen 1979, p. 7). Maryland's seventeenth century immigrants faced a difficult and hostile environment, due mainly to diseases such as malaria, dysentery, typhoid, pneumonia, and influenza. Few settlers reached the age of 50, and the shortage of females hindered the development of a native-born and more acclimatized

population. The average age of marriage for seventeenth century males was 30; the average age of women on the birth of their first child 25. One-quarter of the men never married (Main 1982: 7-15).

Equipped with only a minimum of tools, but always carrying an ax and a hoe, the earliest immigrants advanced up the inlets, rivers, and creeks, "like figures in a frieze" (Gutheim 1949: 45), staying close to the water's edge. Figure 1 (Glaser 1968: maps) is a general orientation map and Figure 2 (Mitchell and Muller 1979: 8) shows this settlement pattern. The settlers occasionally encountered hostile Indians, but the dominant Piscataway groups tended to be more congenial than unfriendly. Combined with the devastating effects of European diseases, occasional warfare, and migration from the area, their receptive attitude eventually led to their effective demise in Maryland by the early eighteenth century (Gutheim 1949: 24-28 and 66-67). Historians estimate that Maryland contained about 11,000 native Americans in 1630 (Mitchell and Muller 1979: 6).

Maryland in the seventeenth century was a land of opportunity for newly-arrived servants who were able to survive. Meticulous research on seventeenth century servants reveals that most remained servants for less than five years, many becoming freehold farmers or planters and

some moving into important positions in local government and society. The basis for their economic success was the "noxious weed," tobacco. (Menard, 1973; pp. 37-64).

The Colonial Tobacco Economy

While opportunities to prosper with tobacco had two vital prerequisites, land and labor, the most successful immigrants were those already wealthy enough to bring servants along with them, for which they received grants of land, or successful enough to purchase servants once in the colony. Land along the rivers was gobbled up quickly in the seventeenth century, often patented in enormous tracts. Figure 3 shows the amount of land already patented by 1696 (Hienton, 1972). John Addison had patented over 4,000 acres along the Potomac by 1700; Thomas Brooke owned over 11,000 acres (Land, 1981; p. 103).

The acquisition of land, however, was of little use without the labor to work that land. Moreover, tobacco's extremely labor-intensive cultivation made labor even more vital. In seventeenth century Maryland, successful tobacco production depended heavily upon servant labor, and even freed servants had to use bonded labor because of the relatively small population of children and women who might have furnished labor on family-based farms. The colonial

tobacco economy, however, experienced a complex series of changes in the latter seventeenth century which tended to push production more and more toward the use of slave labor. Price fluctuations, a decline in the availability of indentured servants, the slow growth of a native-born population, and the increasing availability of African slaves all contributed to this change (Main, 1982: 16-27, 97-123).

Before discussing the far-reaching implications of the transition toward slave labor, a few comments on the general trends of the tobacco economy are in order. Like most staple-crop, export-oriented economies, Maryland's tobacco economy experienced all the advantages and disadvantages of its heavy dependence on a single crop. Falling prices ruined planters or forced retrenchment into self-sufficiency, while rising prices made small and often large fortunes. Periods of warfare could be especially devastating. In the seventeenth century the secular economic trend of tobacco plantations in Maryland was downward, but frequent short-term rises allowed for considerable success. From 1680 to 1720, prices generally declined and the tobacco-oriented planters and farmers endured difficult times. After 1720, and especially after 1730, the economy grew slowly until 1750 when tobacco entered a boom period, called Maryland's "Golden Age" by

Aubrey Land, which lasted until just before the Revolution (Land 1981: 158). Kulikoff's detailed research on the eighteenth century economy points to the expansion of British demand for tobacco as well as grains, the secure and growing market offered by the French tobacco monopoly after 1738, and the surge in available credit from the newly-arrived Scottish merchants and other factors as the basis for rapid economic growth after 1730. The Scottish factors were especially active along the Potomac, although large planters tended to favor consignment over direct sale to the factors. Also important was the establishment of tobacco inspection warehouses and public landings in Maryland after 1747. Finally, historians point to the increasing productivity of slave labor as a significant cause of tobacco expansion. As more and more slaves were born in the Chesapeake area, planters had less and less need to buy slaves. Moreover, native-born slaves tended to be healthier and to live longer. All of these changes lowered planter costs and helped to boost productivity. Tobacco exports from the Chesapeake grew from 40,606,000 pounds in 1730 to 53,206,000 in 1742 and to about 100,000,000 pounds by the 1770s. (Kalikoff 1976: pp. 100-120, and 1979: pp. 275-288; Land 1981: p. 157, 1969: pp. 69-80; Price 1980: passim; Bruner 1979: pp. 71-84; Thompson 1978: pp. 15-25; Papenfuse 1975: passim; Clemens 1980: pp. 113-119; Earle

1978: pp. 51-65; Earle and Hoffman 1976: pp. 21-28; Wychoff 1936: passim; Tyler 1978: pp. 247-248). Maryland produced 33,495,000 pounds or 34.6 percent of the 96,767,000 American total in 1772; Virginia produced most of the remainder (Papenfuse 1975: p. 222; Price 1980: p. 162). Earle (1975: pp. 17-18) notes that the price of tobacco in 1769 was four times greater than in 1747, although the severity of price fluctuation was greater than before 1747.

While the general eighteenth century trend in economic growth was upward, not all planters experienced the same good fortune. Frequent and often drastic short-term price declines generated an uneven pattern of growth, generally favoring the larger, wealthier, and therefore more flexible planters (Clemens 1980: pp. 113-119). Although biased toward wealthier households, eighteenth century estate inventories clearly indicate rising living standards after 1720 within this pattern. They show the growing presence of such amenities as earthern-ware, linens, forks, and spices in many homes for the first time. Especially after 1755, growing income was often applied toward better homes, barns, tobacco houses, and other structures. Throughout the period planters spent excess income or utilized British credit to purchase slaves (Kulikoff 1979b: pp. 275-288).

Despite the general growth in prosperity from the tobacco-based economy of the eighteenth century, there is

evidence to suggest that tobacco planters were not in as secure a position as might be expected. The evidence of the long-term viability of tobacco at the end of the colonial period is inconclusive, complex, and often contradictory. Historians debate the issue by analyzing such factors as planter indebtedness, soil exhaustion, stagnant technology, changing markets, and competition from newly-settled areas. Distilling some of this literature, it appears that the most successful planters were often the most diversified, as farmers and as capitalists. The ability to retreat into self-sufficiency in hard times was another advantage for the more adept planters. Some farmers shifted away from tobacco toward wheat and other grains. This occurred on a massive scale on Maryland's Eastern Shore from the 1720s onward, and wheat became the dominant crop of the fastest-growing areas of both Maryland and Virginia after 1750. Tobacco, however, continued to rule on the Western Shore where the soils were more suited to tobacco production. Earle and Hoffman have analyzed the greater profitability of tobacco production on the Western Shore as based primarily on the fact that the cost of slaves in a labor-intensive crop was lower than the cost of free wage labor in wheat on the Eastern Shore. Combined with other price and cost factors, tobacco production on the Western Shore continued to make economic sense (Earle and Hoffman, 1976: 30-39, 68-73; Kulikoff

1976: 105, 1979: 281-282; Baker, 1940: 66; Earle, 1978: 51-65; Craven, 1965: 59-62; Walsh and Fox, 1974: 81-84). Trends in tobacco production after the American Revolution will be discussed in-depth later.

The Colonial Social Order

1. Demographic Trends.

Dominated by indentured servant immigrants in its earliest decades, Maryland society by the late seventeenth century had begun to make the transition toward the more familiar plantation pattern based on African slave labor. By the 1690s slave imports exceeded servant arrivals, and by 1697 slaves made up about ten percent of Maryland's approximately 30,000 total population. By 1710 the slave population reached nearly 20 percent (18.6), or about 8,000 of Maryland's 43,000 total population. Both slave and white populations continued to grow rapidly, and by 1762 slaves numbered about 48,600 or approximately 30 percent of Maryland's 162,000 total population (Land, 1981: 274).

The transition from servants to slaves was due mainly to availability and therefore to cost. Servants cost from £10 to £20 and generally served for four years before becoming free. Owners also had to pay freedom dues, usually

an extra suit of clothing, a hoe, and some corn. Slaves cost more than servants, from £5 to £35, but their services were purchased for life and their children became part of the owner's property. By 1720 approximately one-quarter of Maryland's planters held slaves, although most owned only from one to four. Only six percent of the planters held more than ten slaves and only two percent over 20. Small planters, those with estates valued at less than £100, owned no slaves but made up over two-thirds of all Maryland households in 1720. As the slave population grew in the eighteenth century, the percentage of slave holders also increased. By 1760 nearly half (46 percent) of Maryland's planters owned slaves, although over half of these held five or fewer. A few planters held 20 to 50 slaves in 1760, and a very few owned a hundred or more distributed among several quarters (Land 1981: 162-167).

2. The Colonial Social Structure.

Historians have been careful in recent years to avoid the stereotyped "moonlight-and-magnolias" image of colonial Southern society derived from the lives of the Revolutionary leaders or from Gone With the Wind (Land 1965: 653). While long aware of the truly historical nature of colonial society, only in the past few decades have historians

systematically applied quantitative methods to colonial social analysis. Influenced by such historians as Aubrey Land and Jackson Turner Main (1965), several historians of colonial Maryland have employed such materials as estate inventories, census data, and tax records to enhance and build upon earlier, more qualitative studies. The works of Gloria Main (1982), Menard (1973, 1975, 1977, 1980), Earle (1975) and Kulikoff (1976) are particularly important, and an effort will be made here to highlight some of their principal findings.

Although a highly-visible planter-merchant elite dominated economic, social, and political life in colonial Maryland, small producers dominated numerically. Table 1 shows that households valued at less than £100 made up at least half of all households in eighteenth century Maryland, even during the expansive years after 1750. Rich planters such as the Addisons were never more than a small minority.

The material conditions of life for Maryland's various planter families have been examined in great detail by Maryland's colonial historians. Planters at the bottom of the social scale lived modestly, most of their possessions being livestock, tools, bedding, and a few household utensils. Livestock might include a saddle horse, a few hogs and cows, and probably some poultry. Most plantation complexes were unpretentious and unattractive, even

ramshackle, since tobacco producers did not typically remain in any single location for more than a few years. Because tobacco exhausted the soil, and because most planters did not manure or otherwise fertilize the soil, the common practice was to abandon the land and associated houses, tobacco barns, and out-buildings every few years.

Even the homes of most planters tended to be rudimentary affairs of one, two, or perhaps three rooms, furnished with benches rather than chairs, without curtains or windows and heated by a brick fireplace at one end. Only the wealthiest planters built the large, two-story brick mansions with lawns, gardens, orchards, outbuildings, and separate slave quarters (Main 1982: 239; Land 1981: 162-167; Earle 1975: 101-140).

As Table 1 indicates, poor planters persisted as the numerical majority of all households in the eighteenth century before the Revolution. Almost none of these planters owned slaves or servants, while most estates valued above £2,100 showed one or more slaves. By the 1750s, economic growth had reduced the percentage of small planters, but not their numbers, and expanded the percentage of middling planters, those whose estates were valued at £101 to £1000 (Land 1981: 278-281).

Aubrey Land suggests that most colonial planters were poor by modern standards, although almost all entered the

market economy with their tobacco crops. To support his statement he calculated tobacco production levels for the four lower Western Shore counties--Prince George's, Charles, Calvert, St. Mary's-- between 1750 and 1759, when the slave population was about two-fifths (38 percent in 1755) of the total (Kulikoff 1976: 93-94). Land determined that 40 percent of all producers grew between 1,000 and 2,000 pounds of tobacco annually, another 40 percent produced 2,001 to 5,000 pounds, 18 percent harvested 5,001 to 10,000 pounds, and only 2 percent produced over 10,000 pounds each year. The low levels of the bottom 40 percent of tobacco planters reflect the fact that no producer at such levels enjoyed the benefit of a single slave, since 1,000 to 2,000 pounds was the average for one laborer. Higher levels of production suggest the presence of slave labor (Land 1967: 471-475).

Great wealth in colonial Maryland depended upon more than tobacco planting. Maryland's richest men gained their wealth by diversifying their interests into commerce, banking, manufacturing, land speculation, political office-holding for fees, and other activities; most also planted tobacco. By the 1770s Maryland's elite families had developed a strong sense of identity "strengthened by common interests and reinforced by intermarriage within the charmed circle" (Land 1981: 774) Land offers examples of such

kinship networks: the Eastern Shore Lloyds married into the Tilghmans, Chews, and Pacas; the four daughters of Benjamin Tasker married, respectively, Governor Samuel Ogle, Daniel Dulany The Younger, Christopher Lowndes of Bladensburg and Robert Carter of Nomini Hall in Virginia. Kinship charts of the first families became, Land adds, "a tangled net, with filiations that baffle the eye" (Land 1981: 276). The extreme case occurred within the Addison family of Oxon Hill Manor, when Colonel Thomas Addison (1679-1727) became by marriage both brother-in-law and father-in-law to Richard Smith. He accomplished this by marrying Richard's sister, Eleanor Smith, and also by marrying Smith's daughter by an earlier marriage. Intermarriage among the Brice, Beale, and Worthington families resulted in the remarkably named descendant, Brice Thomas Beale Worthington (Land 1981: 276; Land 1967: 476-482; Johnson 1908: 69-71).

3. Colonial Prince George's County

The area of Maryland which became Prince George's County in 1695 was settled well after the arrival of the first immigrants in the 1630s. Until late in the seventeenth century, fear of Indian hostility along the Potomac and the superior tobacco lands along the Patuxent River directed settlers northward along the Patuxent River

and westward into the river's watershed. As the Indian danger subsided and as available land along the Patuxent divided up, new arrivals began to patent lands and establish plantations along the Potomac. Settled relatively later, Prince George's County did not pass through a period in which servant labor dominated the economy. Slave labor came with the turn-of-the-century settlers, and by 1705 slaves made up about one-third of the county's population. Their numbers would reach about one-half of the county's population by 1769 (Kulkoff, 1976, pp. 15, 112-120, 319).

One of the best means to understand the social order which developed in eighteenth century Prince George's County is to examine the patterns of wealth distribution. Table 2 shows the percentage of slaves on plantations of various sizes between 1658 and 1790.

The figures to 1730 include neighboring Charles County. The 1776 data underestimates the percentage of slaves on large plantations, because the 1776 census did not include the eastern or Patuxent River side of the county where most of the wealthiest planters lived.

Although Table 2 demonstrates that slaveholding became concentrated during the eighteenth century, the properties of households owning slaves also increased from 25-30 percent in 1706-1710 to 52 percent by 1776. Many of the slaveowners in 1776, however, were not landowners, but

tenants. Fully 60 percent of all county householders in 1776 were tenants, and 40 percent of the tenants (17 percent of all householders) owned slaves. (Kulkoff, 1976: pp. 185-186, 123-124).

The expansion of slavery in Prince George's County was very rapid in the eighteenth century. By 1755 the slave population of the county, along with those of Calvert and Anne Arundel counties, was 40 percent. In 1776, 39.1 percent of the population of the Potomac side of Prince George's County--the poorer side--was slave (Papenfuse, 1972, p. 300).

By 1783 the county contained 8,919 slaves, or 48 percent of the total county population of 18,527. Only Anne Arundel County had a larger black population (9,277), although blacks made up 47 percent of that county's total population of 19,851. In fact, no Maryland county surpassed Prince George's percentage of blacks (Kulkoff, 1976: pp. 431-33).

Within Prince George's County itself, slaveholding patterns by the 1780s varied somewhat among the units called Hundreds. Slave percentages along the Potomac River were lower than along the more tobacco-oriented Patuxent River. The Potomac Hundreds held slave populations ranging from 30 to 40 percent of the total, while the Upper Marlboro area near the Patuxent contained 60 percent slaves. Oxon

Hundred, the administrative unit in which Oxon Hill Manor was located in 1783, contained only 30 percent slaves, due mainly to the high proportion of tenant households (66 percent) in that hundred (Kulikoff, 1976, pp. 204-206, 373, 532).

As plantations grew larger, slaves tended to be moved on to quarters located away from the owner's house. In mid-eighteenth century Prince George's County a quarter might be one of the outbuildings, a separate small structure, or part of a collection of dwellings. Slave cabins ranged from 12 by 12 feet to 16 by 20 feet and were cheaply furnished with straw bedding, empty barrels for chairs, a few cooking utensils, and a grindstone or handmill for grinding corn. Most quarters also had livestock and vegetable gardens nearby. They were usually placed close to the plantation owners' tobacco, corn, or other fields (Kulikoff, 1976, pp. 204-206). The distribution of slave ownership among slaveowners was very unequal, as Table 2 shows. By 1776, 52 percent of all households owned slaves, but most owned only a small number while a few held dozens or even hundreds. Most slaveowners were also landowners, although 17 percent of the county's households were slaveowning tenants. Some landowners and tenants also rented slaves (Kulikoff, 1976, p. 125).

Land and slave ownership varied considerably within

Prince George's County in the latter eighteenth century. The 1776 Census of the Potomac River Hundreds shows a range of non-slaveowning tenants from 32 percent to 66 percent of all households, indicating that even land ownership had become virtually impossible for a substantial proportion of county residents. The figure of 66 percent was for Oxon Hundred, the location of Oxon Hill Manor in 1776. Large landowners like the Addisons and Roziers and the merchant-planter Christopher Lowndes retained thousands of acres of land and rented parcels to the numerous tenants (Kulikoff 1981: 122, 146).

While a complete understanding of the distribution of wealth in eighteenth century Prince George's County is not yet possible, considerable evidence on the structure of landholding and the excellent studies of Papenfuse (1972), Earle (1972) and Kulikoff (1976) strongly argue that by 1776, before the opening of the West, Maryland society in general and Prince George's County society in particular, had become somewhat ossified and closed. The data presented by Land (1968, 1965, 1967, 1981) supports these assertions, although Land does not address the issue directly. While the classic study by Craven (1925) came to the same conclusion, the newer studies use different arguments and reject Craven's assertion that soil exhaustion was the basic cause of social inequality by the late colonial period.

Craven argued that destructive agricultural practices had exhausted the soils of Maryland and Virginia by 1776 and that the resulting lower agricultural production with population pressure was forcing the tenants to migrate to new lands (Craven, 1925: pp. 59-62). In a direct assault on the Craven thesis, Papenfuse argues convincingly that the soil was not exhausted and that average yields had not declined, but agrees that population pressure was creating a crowded situation. Papenfuse's study is based on trends within Prince George's County (1972: passim).

Papenfuse calculated the size of average land holdings and points out that both landowners and leaseholders, who made up over half of all planters, suffered no shortage of available land for planting tobacco. Average holdings in 1776 were about 168 acres, or 154 acres when discounting the statistically biased reports of land holders over 500 acres. He also challenges Craven's notions about soil exhaustion, asserting that planters exhausted portions of their landholdings very consciously. Once the soil was exhausted by tobacco in three or four years, planters simply moved to fresh lands. Given the distribution of available labor in Prince George's County leaseholds in 1776, the average size of land holdings was more than adequate to provide planters with new land when needed (Papenfuse, 1972, pp. 297-310).

Rejecting inadequate land and poor agricultural methods

as the basis of economic difficulties by 1776, Papenfuse's and the other newer studies direct their attention to the distribution of labor and to the growing presence of tenancy. Almost all landowners owned slaves while most tenants did not. Although 40 percent of Prince George's County tenants owned slaves in 1776, most of these owned only one or two at most. The 1776 census indicates that 71.8 percent of all tenants had one or fewer slaves (Papenfuse, 1972; p. 304; Kulikoff, 1976: pp. 185-186). Papenfuse profiles the typical landholder and tenant in 1776 Prince George's County by calculating that the average landowner owned slaves and farmed about 150 acres of land while the average tenant owned no slaves and farmed about 100 acres. He concludes that by 1776 "the limit of opportunity in a staple economy" had been reached in Prince George's County. Although soil exhaustion was not the principal cause, many residents were migrating from the county while others remained and struggled with difficult economic conditions (Papenfuse, 1972: pp. 300,310). Kulikoff's study of Prince George's County draws the same conclusions for more or less the same reasons (Kulikoff, 1976: pp. 407-419).

Skaggs (1973) presents additional data on landholding in Prince George's County in the eighteenth century. Economic growth in Maryland after 1720, he observes, pushed

land values ever higher and increasingly reduced the ability of the less wealthy to purchase land. While rates varied, the pattern of increasing tenancy was the same in the four counties he studied: Baltimore, Prince George's, Queen Anne's, and Talbot. Overall, land ownership in the four counties declined from 44.0 percent in 1756 to 37.0 by 1771. In Prince George's County the decline was from 38.9 to 31.6 percent, so that by 1771 less than one-third of all Prince George's County householders owned land. Median land ownership was 157-209 acres, not unlike figures given by other researchers (Skaggs, 1973: pp. 39-49). Skaggs also offers details on the distribution of land ownership, as shown in Table 3 (Skaggs, 1973: p. 43).

While the pattern of land ownership between 1756 and 1771 did not alter significantly among landowners, the table underscores the unequal distribution of land among county landholders. In 1756 almost half (47.5 percent) of all landowners held less than 200 acres; in 1771 the distribution was similar, with 46.3 percent under 200 acres.

Studies of tenancy in eighteenth century Maryland by Stiverson (1977) and in All Hallow's Parish, Anne Arundel County by Earle (1972) make similar arguments to Stiverson's analysis. Stiverson's analysis focuses on the structure of tenancy on Lord Baltimore's proprietary manors, where tenants paid lower rents and held longer-term leases than on

private estates. His research, however, also incorporates data on private tenant arrangements. Tenancy increased in eighteenth century Maryland, just as it expanded in Prince George's County, from one-third of all landholdings in 1700 to over one-half by the 1770s (Papenfuse, 1972: pp. 301-302). By the 1760s the average proprietary leasehold was about 140 acres, similar to Papenfuse's 154 for Prince George's County, although the land tended to be of poor quality (Stiverson, 1977: xiii-55).

The tenants were generally poor, owned no slaves, and lived in small houses without flooring and without brick chimneys. The 13 tenements of George Nater, a wealthy planter in St. Mary's County, averaged 16 feet by 28 feet in 1802. Only three had brick chimneys, the rest being wood-lined with brick, clay, or stone. In the lower Western Shore the average proprietary tenant house was 16-17 feet by 24-25 feet, two or three rooms, with a wood frame covered in clapboard. Most had dirt floors with occasional planking away from the fireplace, made of wood and clay and a loft for storage or sleeping. The common storage buildings on tenant lands were tobacco houses, usually 500 to 650 square feet in size. Few had corncribs or livestock shelter, although almost all tenants owned livestock. Over half of all tenements had orchards, with apples predominating over peaches. Orchards may not have been as typical of private

tenements, however, since proprietary tenants were required to plant 100 fruit trees. Average tenant households included six children, which undoubtedly made living very crowded. Pointing out that very little literary evidence is available on poor whites in the eighteenth century Chesapeake, Stiverson supports the observations of the Marquise de Chastell, a French traveler in 1780-1782 who referred to the "miserable huts inhabited by whites, whose wane looks and ragged garments bespeak poverty" (Stiverson, 1977b: 56-84).

Stiverson asserts that unlike other parts of Maryland in the latter eighteenth century, the lower Western Shore made little progress toward agricultural diversification. Tobacco, he explains, continued to dominate for several reasons. First, its labor-intensive nature kept slaves fully employed in an economy where few alternative opportunities were available. Second, methods of cultivation and an efficient marketing system were well established. The presence of Scottish and English factors offering credit was especially important to the tenants, even if they tended to lock tenants and larger planters into tobacco production. Third, and this was again important to tenants, tobacco production required few tools. Finally, tobacco required much less land than alternative crops (Stiverson, 1977b: 92-93).

Like Papenfuse, Stiverson rejects Craven's argument that soil exhaustion was a significant factor at this time. He points out that most tenant farms produced only about 1,000 pounds of tobacco annually, on one to three acre tracts. Corn typically took up 15 acres and may have been even more destructive to the soil than tobacco. Most corn was consumed by the residents or their livestock, along with any vegetables or fruit grown on the tenement. Stiverson concludes that land shortages and soil exhaustion do not explain growing poverty in late colonial Maryland. Rather, the explanation lies in the low returns of small-scale agriculture, an agriculture usually without slave labor, without new and more valuable crops, and with large families consuming most of the surplus (Stiverson, 1977, pp. 85-142).

Writing of eighteenth century All Hallow's Parish, located in Anne Arundel County across the Patuxent River from Prince George's County, Carville Earle also assesses the growth of tenancy. In that parish, he notes, the number of households grew by 73 percent from 1707 to 1783 while the number of landowners grew by only 12.7 percent. This led to an increase of tenancy from about one-fifth of all households in 1670 to one-third in 1699 to about one-half by 1783. Growing populations and the associated rise in land values was at the root of increased landlessness, and by the latter eighteenth century most tenants in the parish farmed

about 100 acres (Earle 1972: pp. 203-212; Giddens 1933: pp. 158-159). Earle and Stiverson observe that "developmental leasing," or leases by which tenants were required to improve the leasehold, were very common by the late eighteenth century on both private and proprietary estates. Capital improvements typically included the planting of fruit trees, clearing land, building and maintaining a dwelling house, fencing, and restrictions on cutting wood. Other requirements varied according to the situation, although the overwhelming tendency for leases to be oral rather than written agreements severely limits our full understanding of the phenomenon. Like Papenfuse, Stiverson, Craven, and Earle believe that population pressure in All Hallow's Parish was reaching a critical point by 1776 (Earle 1972: pp. 212-213; Stiverson 1977: pp. 8-11).

In his analysis of All Hallow's Parish, Earle offers an assessment of social and economic patterns which may have been repeated, at least to some extent, in Prince George's County. He stresses the pervasiveness of tobacco, reflected in such visual features as tobacco barns, abandoned fields, the absence of substantial urban centers, the scattered distribution of rural plantations, and gangs of black slaves. He points out that comparative data on the American Colonies in the 1770's, compiled in an extraordinary study by Alice Hansen Jones (1980), shows the average Chesapeake

planter of 1770 to be wealthier than all other individuals along the Atlantic seaboard, "with the single exception of Charleston, South Carolina and its environs." (Earle 1975: 3). Despite growing poverty in the county, it appears that the economic position of Prince George's County planters may have been quite sound at that time.

Earle also examines the organization and development of plantation agriculture in eighteenth century All Hallow's Parish. He differs with Craven's emphasis on soil exhaustion as a factor which seriously undermined the economy during the century. While he agrees that tobacco exhausted the soil in three or four years, he explains that planters generally followed with corn for one or two years, then shifted to fresh lands. In seven years the "old field" could produce firewood and in 20 years board lumber -- and tobacco again. Earle sees no long-term decline in tobacco yields in this era, and calculates that a laborer could produce about 1,800-1,900 pounds of tobacco a year with 10,000 plants on two to three acres. He adds that continued clearing did lead to a depletion of the woodlands in the parish as early as 1730 (Earle 1975: pp. 18-29).

All Hallow's Parish planters did not use manure on tobacco, Earle asserts, because it kept tobacco green and growing too long. Corn, however, was manured, and some tenants penned tobacco fields to collect manure.

Fertilizers such as lime, marl, or plaster of paris were not used, and only the exceptional planter adopted crop rotations with legumes, grasses, or turnips. Although planters did not attempt to improve previously cultivated soils by crop rotation, they were not entirely dependent on tobacco. As early as 1710, 10 percent of the parish plantations grew wheat, a figure which reached almost 50 percent by 1750 as markets opened in Southern Europe and the West Indies. Planters also grew peas, beans, oats, rye, barley and flax, developed orchards for cider and brandy, and diversified their livestock. Draft oxen were rare, since most planters used steers, not horses, for pulling plows. Earle stresses the fact that such diversification represented a sensible response to the exigencies of the fluctuating tobacco market; that is, a defensive ability to become self-sufficient when tobacco prices were low (Earle 1975: pp. 101-140).

The eighteenth century social and economic structure of Talbot County, on Maryland's eastern shore, has been analyzed in some depth by Paul Clemens (1975, 1980). Clemens observes that by the 1730s, 53.3 percent of all householders were tenants and that 78.0 percent of all householders owned no slaves. Moreover, among the 22 percent of households owning slaves, 81.2 percent (or 17.5 percent of all householders) owned from one to five slaves.

Tenants in 1730's Talbot County rented only about 50 acres of land and lived a typically primitive lifestyle. Tenants, however, lived considerably better than agricultural laborers. Among the landowners, only nine percent owned over 1,000 acres, while 38 percent owned from 200 to 1,000 acres and 53 percent under 200 acres. The same 53 percent figure held for landowners under 200 acres in 1756. Landed planters without slaves, Clemens notes, owned about double the personal property of tenants but lived in quite similar fashion.

The real change in material conditions occurred among the slaveholding landowners. Typically they lived in spacious brick homes with separate kitchens, and with pewterware and silver plate in addition to earthenware. Most had large gardens and orchards and most planted several market crops. Although generally twice as wealthy as other landowners (excluding the value of slaves), about half of all slaveholders owned less than 200 acres of land. Most leased some land to tenants. Perhaps more dramatic was the distribution of total wealth in 1730s Talbot County. The 30 men who dominated Talbot County, a group of lawyers, merchants, agricultural entrepreneurs, and provincial officeholders, owned an average of £2,700 each. They made up only two percent of the county's non-dependent population but controlled 45 percent of its property. The bottom third

of society, the sharecroppers, laborers, and tradesmen, owned just 2 percent of the wealth (Clemens, 1980: pp. 144-161).

The implications of the foregoing analysis of colonial Maryland, Prince George's County and other regions will be more fully addressed in the chapter dealing with site-specific research. By way of summary, however, a few general observations will be useful. First, tobacco was the driving force of the colonial economy, even before slaves replaced indentured servants in the eighteenth century. As in most staple-based colonial economies, Maryland suffered the short-term drastic swings in prices and the limitations of dependence on foreign markets. Second, the eighteenth century secular economic trend was one of improvement, especially after 1750. Within the trend toward expansion, however, lesser planters fell increasingly into tenancy. Tenancy appears to have been greatest along the poorer Potomac side of Prince George's County, although the rate was over 50 percent of all county householders by 1776. Third, slavery became entrenched as the basic labor system in tobacco. Those planters owning slaves tended to become increasingly wealthy as the century progressed, owing in part to the natural growth of their slave population. Fourth, the most economically diversified planters tended to be the most economically successful -- and the most politically powerful -- because of greater flexibility.

Maryland's richest and most powerful families were usually tobacco planters, but they were also active in political officeholding for fees, manufacturing, commerce, and land speculation. Fifth, diversification away from tobacco toward wheat, other crops, and livestock was occurring in some regions of Maryland. The movements toward wheat on the Eastern Shore is well known; the degree of diversification among planters in All Hallow's Parish, Anne Arundel County, less so. The precise pattern of agricultural production in Prince George's County before the Revolution is not clearly understood.

Oxon Hill Manor in Colonial Maryland

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the themes of ownership, land use, and labor patterns as they relate to the actual Oxon Hill Manor site. The intention is not only to present factual details on the site but also to analyze changes at the estate within the context of the local, regional and national trends discussed in the historical overview. This section also includes available cartographic information.

1. Ownership and Status, 1674-1774

Figure 4 is a genealogical chart of the Addison family, owners of Oxon Hill Manor until 1810. Led by Colonel John Addison (d. 1705-1706), the Addisons quickly built one of Maryland's largest and most valuable estates. From the time of his arrival in Maryland in 1674 until his death in 1705 or 1706, John Addison acquired 6,478.5 acres of land. The acreage of the Oxon Hill Manor site itself, acquired in 1687 (Mackintosh 1974: 75), is not known. The fact that his son, Thomas, elected to build an elaborate mansion at the site in 1710 or 1711 (Castle, 1957) strongly suggests that John Addison had developed his principal plantation there (Carr and Jordan 1974: 232-234).

By the time of his death in 1727, Thomas Addison owned 14,281 acres of land in Maryland. The exact acreage at Oxon Hill was not indicated in the 1727 inventory, but the estate included seven quarters, the Great House tract, a mill, and a "store" at the Potomac River landing. The house itself had eight rooms, two "closets" or upstairs rooms without windows (Main, 1982: 295), a passage, cellar kitchen, and garret (attic space). The "cellar kitchen" appeared to be detached from the house since it followed the "passage" in the inventory and since it had a little "shad" (shed) room connected to it. The "shed" appeared to have been divided in to three separate rooms, one of which was a "negroe's room." The inventory lists these three rooms as "in the

shade" (Maryland Hall of Records (MHR), Annapolis, Inventories, 1727).

The estate in 1727 listed 75 slaves, with 23 at the Great House. It also listed three indentured servants, one of whom was a gardener. Two of the slaves were mulattoes and both were listed as "carpenter and cooper." No indication was given as to housing for the slaves and servants except for the "negroe's room in the shade." To house such a large number of slaves and servants undoubtedly required quarters beyond the mansion house itself. The Great House also required some kind of fencing or housing for 63 cattle, 13 horses (two coach horses), and 48 sheep. Another 226 cattle and one horse were scattered among the seven quarters (MHR, Inventories, 1727).

Thomas Addison left an estate of 3,863 acres to his eldest son, John Addison (1712-1764). John's inheritance included parts of what would later be surveyed by his son, Thomas (c.1740-1774) as the 3,663 acre Oxon Hill Manor. Thomas Addison also left another son, Thomas (1714-1770), his "Gisbrorough" estate and three other tracts totalling 1,746 acres, plus half of five small tracts along Oxon Branch (half of 1,264 acres). Another son, the Reverend Henry Addison (1717-1789), received the other half of the five tracts plus 1,517 acres, some of which was located to the north on the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River and at

the Falls of the Potomac. A fourth son, Anthony Addison, inherited 2,000 acres, all to the north of Oxon Hill. An additional 2,300 acres was divided among Thomas, Henry, and Anthony (Maryland Historical Society (MHS), Baltimore, Manuscript Collection, Addison Family Papers).

John Addison's 3,863 acres were probably the same acres from which the 3,663-acre Oxon Hill Manor estate was surveyed by his son, Thomas (c.1740-1794), in 1767. Figure 5 is a plat of the manor in 1767 (MHR, Patented Survey No. 1590, 1767). When John Addison died in 1764, his estate was divided into three quarters, rather than the seven in 1727. The room designation is unclear in his 1765 inventory, although the configuration is similar to 1727. The 1765 inventory listed three, not two closets, a "chamber" and a "spinning room." It also separated the cellar and kitchen from the "cellar kitchen" designation of 1727. Two possibly new structures, a milk house and a meat house, appear in 1765. The estate listed only 41 slaves, down from 75 in 1727. The main house, however, had 24 slaves, almost identical to the 23 listed in 1727 (MHR, Inventories, 1765).

Thomas Addison inherited Oxon Hill Manor in 1764, but did not live long enough to watch his children grow to adulthood. He died in 1774, leaving the estate to his oldest son, Walter Dulany Addison (1769-1848), then only five years of age. Thomas Addison had "resurveyed" the

estate in 1767 (see Figure 5) and it is from this survey that we have a precise layout of the property. By 1774 he also owned various other properties, including the 1,613-acre "Gisborough Manor" left him by his uncle, another Thomas, in 1770. Addison left Gisborough to his second son, John, when he left the Oxon Hill estate to Walter Dulany (Maryland Historical Society, Name file, Laurel News Leader, January 26, 1976). He left John an additional 1,270 acres and his third son, Thomas Grafton Addison (b. circa 1774), 1,200 acres. He also arranged for the lease of a house and land at Hart Park, part of Oxon Hill Manor, to his brother John. In all, Thomas Addison owned 5,133 acres at his death in 1774. He made no provision for a fouth son, Henry, who was born after his death (Maryland Historical Society, Addison Family Papers).

The inventory of Oxon Hill Manor in 1775 listed only two quarters in addition to the manor house tract. The configuration of the rooms was similar to the earlier inventories, but the 1775 document included a "porch closet", a "back porch" probably attached to the kitchen, and an "overseer's house" between the house and kitchen. No separate outbuildings were listed, as in 1765, although they were certainly present. Addison had expanded his slave holdings to 109 slaves, 60 of whom were at the manor house. The estate was probably even more potentially

self-sufficient than previously, since the slaves at the main house included a shoemaker, a carter, a gardener, a midwife, three carpenters, a coachman, and a "joiner." A slave carpenter was also listed at "Clarkson's Quarter." Animals at the house included 64 of 69 cattle, 4 oxen, 20 of 28 horses, 4 coach horses, 120 sheep, and 49 of 101 total hogs. Addison apparently lived very ostentatiously, traveling about in a "London coach and four" with matched bay horses with outriders (Castle, 1957). The Reverend Jonathan Boucher, husband of Addison's sister Eleanor, was very impressed with Oxon Hill Manor. Married there in 1772, Boucher described the estate as "the most pleasantly situated and circumstanced, and in all respects the most desireable of any I have ever seen in any part of the world" (Boucher, 1925; p.51).

Table 4 compares the estates of the Oxon Hill Manor owners in 1727, 1765, and 1775. The decline in the overall value of personal property, including slaves, from 1727 to 1765 probably reflects the dispersal of Thomas Addison's 1727 estate among several sons. Since economic conditions after 1727 were generally much better than before that date, the fact that the number of slaves at the manor house did not increase suggests that John Addison may have been less economically active than his father. The drastic decline in the number of cattle could indicate either dispersal or

diversification. The lower value of John Addison's slaves can be misleading in interpreting the importance of slavery to Oxon Hill Manor in 1765. More informative is the fact that slaves were 58 percent of the value of personal property of Oxon Hill, compared to 51 percent in 1727. Moreover, average slave value in 1765 was £33, compared to £25 in 1727. This higher value could represent higher average age of the slaves, although that is unlikely in view of the increase in slave workers through domestic population growth rather than immigration.

Economically, socially, and politically, the Addisons were among Maryland's most prominent families in the eighteenth century. Probably at its highest at the time of Thomas Addison's death in 1774, their status faded after the American Revolution for reasons to be discussed later. Comparing Table 1 and Table 4 reveals that in 1727, 1765, and 1775, Oxon Hill Manor was among the top few percent of all Maryland estates and that Thomas Addison's £5,275 estate value in 1775 may have placed him among the top few families. The same holds true in regard to landholding. Oxon Hill Manor's 3,663 acres also placed the estate within Prince George's County's and Maryland's top few percent of all landed units, as can be seen from Table 3 and from the earlier discussion of landholding. Comparing Table 2 and Table 4 illustrates that Oxon Hill Manor was among the

largest slave plantations as well. The eighteenth century trend toward increased concentration of slaveowning was well represented at Oxon Hill Manor. Moreover, the number of slaves at the estate was much higher than the average number of slaves per household in two in 1710 and five in 1782 (Kulikoff 1976: 112-120). The Addison's prominence as slaveowners appears even more impressive in view of their location on the relatively poorer, Potomac side of Prince George's County.

The high social and political status of the eighteenth century Addisons is best illustrated by a brief history of the owners of Oxon Hill Manor and of some key relatives. Colonel John Addison (d.1705-1706) was a member of a prominent family of merchants and clergymen in England. He was the brother of Launcelot Addison, Dean of Litchfield and chaplain to Charles II, of Anthony Addison, Chaplain to the Duke of Marlborough, and of Thomas and Henry Addison, merchants of Whitehaven. His uncle was the celebrated author, Joseph Addison. Arriving in Maryland in 1674, John Addison married Rebecca Dent, widow of a wealthy planter, Thomas Dent, and daughter of the Reverend William Williamson, the first Protestant clergyman in Maryland.

Addison was an active merchant, Indian trader, and planter in Charles County. He was a partner with several English merchants, and in the early 1680s one of his ships

was seized for violation of the Navigation Acts. He was also transporting indentured servants into Maryland at this time. By 1687 he owned 1,500 acres of land and had received his first political appointment-- justice of Charles County. Afterward, he received numerous commissions and rose to political prominence as a member of the Council of Maryland (1691), a justice of the Provincial Court (1692), a colonel of Charles and of Prince George's County (1695), a trustee of King William's School (now St. John's College) in Annapolis, and a Commisary General or Justice for Probate of Wills (1699). By the time of his death in 1705 or 1706 he had a considerable estate, which he left to his only son, Thomas (Murray 1895: p. 13; Carr and Jordan 1974: pp. 232-234; Richardson 1913: p. 1; Howard 1919: pp. 387-394).

Colonel Thomas Addison (1669-1727) married twice, both times into wealthy Maryland families. His first wife, Elizabeth Tasker (1701), was the daughter of Thomas Tasker, a rich planter, member of the Council of Maryland, justicé of the High Provincial Court, and Treasurer of Maryland. Their daughter, Rebecca (b. 1703), would later marry Colonel George Plater, owner of Sotterley on the Patuxent River and one of Maryland's most powerful men. This marriage also connected the Addisons to Virginia's aristocracy. The Plater's son, George Plater (1753-1792), would become Governor of Maryland in 1791. Thomas Addison's second wife,

Eleanor Smith (1709), was the daughter of Colonel Walter Smith. Eleanor's sister, Rebecca Smith, married Daniel Dulaney the Elder (1685-1753), one of Maryland's richest and most powerful men. Dulaney held such offices as Receiver-General of Revenues, Attorney-General, Commissary General, Chief Judge of the Court of Vice-Admiralty, and member of Lord Baltimore's Council of State. The Dulanys became connected to the Addisons via another route when Rachel Dulany, daughter of Rebecca Smith Dulany and Daniel Dulany the Elder, married the Reverend Henry Addison (1717-1789) in 1751. The Reverend Henry Addison was Thomas Addison's youngest son.

Like his father, Colonel Thomas Addison held numerous political offices. He became Surveyor of Prince George's County (1696), Deputy to the Potomac District Naval Officer (1697), an Indian commissioner, member of the Council of Maryland (1710), Colonel and head of Prince George's County Militia (1714), Sheriff of Prince George's County, Justice of the Provincial Court, a land commissioner, Surveyor of the Western Shore (1718), and Commissary General (1721). He had developed a large estate by his death in 1727, which he dispersed among his wife, Eleanor (1761), his daughter, Ann (b. 1711/12), and his sons John (1713-1764), Thomas (1714-1770), Henry (1717-1789) and Anthony (Van Horn 1976: 112; Wilstach 1931: 329; Stoeckel 1958: 34;

Howard, 1919: p. 394; Land, 1953: pp. 192-193 and 1968: pp. 40, 59; Hienton, 1972: pp. 18, 21; Kellock, 1962: pp. 22, 24; Richardon, 1913: pp. 2-3; Bowie, 1975: pp. 32-33).

About the next owner of Oxon Hill Manor, Captain John Addison (1713-1764), we know little. He married Susannah Wilkinson (d. 1773) and had several children, including Thomas (c. 1740-1775), John, Anthony, Ann, and Eleanor. The Reverend Jonathan Boucher, who married Eleanor at Oxon Hill Manor in 1772, described John Addison as "an irregular and intemperate man" who "of course, died young" (Boucher, 1925: pp. 51-53). During his short life, however, Addison served as a Justice of the Provincial Court and as a delegate to the Provincial Assembly from 1745 to 1754 (Van Horn, 1976: pp. 88, 99; Stoeckel, 1958: p. 35). The relatively lower value of his estate in 1765, compared to those of his father in 1727 and his son in 1775, suggests that he may have been less active than the others. John's younger brother, Major Thomas Addison (1714-1770), was treated very harshly in Boucher's Reminiscences. After a successful military career, Thomas retired to his 1,613 acre "Gisborough" estate around 1765. Boucher referred to the estate as Thomas's "little patrimony near Oxon Hill" and he chided Addison for becoming "moped [sic] and melancholy" and for giving himself up "to the habits of sottishness and vulgarity." Boucher reported that Thomas became alcoholic, "addicted not only to

low company, but to the worst kind of liquor, intoxicating himself daily with a vile spiritous distillation from molasses, there called New England rum." Thomas died within five years of his retirement in 1770 (Boucher, 1925: pp. 51-53; MHR, Debt Books, Prince George's County, 1766-70, Liber 35, fol. 1).

Boucher became a close friend of John Addison's younger brother, the Reverend Henry Addison (1717-1789), when Henry brought his two sons to Boucher's school in Caroline County, Virginia to be tutored. Boucher had developed a favorable reputation as a tutor in Virginia, which apparently influenced George Washington's decision to send his stepson, Jack Custis, to Boucher's school (Zimmer, 1978: pp. 68-69). Henry Addison was rector of St. John's Church on the Potomac River south of Oxon Hill, a post he had held since 1742. His estate, 1,407 acres near Oxon Hill and including part of the "Hart Park" tract which was also part of Oxon Hill Manor, was called "Barnaby Manor" (MHS, Addison Family Papers). He was married to Rachel Dulany Knight, the widowed daughter of Daniel Dulany the Elder. Her brother, Daniel Dulany the younger, was Secretary-General of Maryland, a member of the Provincial Council, and a leader of the Maryland Bar. Another brother, Walter Dulany, was Mayor of Annapolis, Commissary General and a member of the Provincial Council. Walter was also the father of Rebecca

Dulany, the woman who would marry John Addison's son, Thomas, the heir to Oxon Hill Manor (Zimmer, 1978, pp. 68-69; Land, 1968:passim).

Thomas Addison (c. 1740-1774) did not live a long life, even by eighteenth century standards, but he appears to have been a very active planter. He may have focused his energies on Oxon Hill Manor, since he does not show up in the records as being politically active in the same manner as his predecessors. He appears only as a justice of the county court (1761-1764, 1766-1769), and there is no mention of a military title. His relative youth may explain some of his lack of political visibility. When Addison married Rebecca Dulany (1747-1829) in 1767, he reinforced the close ties to the Dulanys initiated earlier. The Dulanys, however, and the Reverend Boucher became active Loyalists during the Revolutionary years and lost considerable property. Addison's death in 1774 may have saved Oxon Hill Manor from confiscation, although we have no evidence as to what his loyalties would have been. His brother, Colonel John ("Jack") Addison, apparently led Maryland troops during the Revolution and served as an aide to George Washington (Stoeckel, 1958:p. 35). Described, however, by Zimmer as "Eleanor's improvident brother" (1978:p. 69), John lost his property called "The Lodge" near Oxon Hill to the Reverend Boucher in 1773. Forced to sell because of debts, he sold

an estate of about 1,000 acres of land, some buildings, and 26 slaves. Boucher, who had used his Addison and Dulany connections to establish an excellent living in Annapolis, developed the Lodge estate by reclaiming land, planting timothy, and creating a "falling garden" on the sloping land along the Potomac River across from Alexandria. Because of their loyalist sympathies, Boucher, Henry Addison, and several other family members left Maryland in 1775. Boucher's estate, valued at £4,445, was confiscated during the Revolution. Henry Addison lost some property, but he was able to pass "Barnaby Manor" on to his son, Anthony, when he died in Maryland in 1789 (Zimmer, 1978: p. 342; Land, 1968: p. 318; McGraqth, 1950: pp. 362-370).

The foregoing examination of the Addisons from 1674 to roughly 1774 reveals the economic, social, and political prominence of the family in eighteenth century Maryland. The Addisons and their wealthy associates were the families that built the large brick mansions overlooking waterways, surrounded by outbuildings, orchards, gardens and lawns, and worked by slave (and tenant) labor. As such an estate, Oxon Hill Manor appears to have reached an apogee around 1774. The early death of Thomas Addison disrupted the orderly transition from father to son and created legal confusion in the management of the estate. Following almost immediately upon Addison's death, the American Revolution also disrupted

the family and may have had negative effects on the successful operation of the estate as a slave plantation. The following discussion of land use patterns and labor trends covers Oxon Hill Manor from its origins until 1793, the year in which Walter Dulany Addison moved onto the estate. While the colonial period ended, technically speaking, in 1783, it is historically sensible to treat the years from 1774 to 1793 as a transition phase at Oxon Hill Manor. As will be made clear later, in historical perspective this period established the preconditions for Walter Dulany Addison's eventual decision to sell Oxon Hill Manor.

2. Land Use and Labor Patterns, 1674-1793

That Oxon Hill Manor was essentially a typicallly wealthy tobacco plantation in eighteenth century Maryland seems evident. Tobacco was the key cash crop of the area and the movement toward diversification characteristic of the Eastern Shore and other areas did not take hold along the Potomac. Oxon Hill Manor demonstrated the typical eighteenth century patterns of most tobacco areas in Maryland and Tidewater Virginia: a tendency toward greater dependence on tobacco and on slave labor. The slave population grew rapidly in Prince George's County, making it

corrections made through p. 70

7 Dec

the largest slaveholding county in Maryland before the Revolution. The Potomac half of the county, however, held fewer slaves than the Patuxent side and relied more heavily on tenant labor. Tenants presumably grew tobacco, although no evidence is available to prove this assertion. By the time of the first inventory of Oxon Hill Manor, in 1727, slavery and tobacco were well established in Maryland. The inventory listed three indentured servants, whereas none appeared in the 1765 or 1775 documents. Combined with the growing number of slave children in the inventories, especially in 1775, the absence of servants after 1727 follows the pattern of decreasing servants and increasing native-born slaves as the eighteenth century progressed. The 1775 inventory also demonstrates a greater capacity for self-sufficiency at the estate. This can be seen in the expansion of specialized workers, from two carpenters and coopers and one gardener in 1727, to two carpenters in 1765, to a shoemaker, a carter, a gardener, a midwife, three carpenters, a coachman, and a "joiner" in 1775. Recalling the earlier discussions of eighteenth century economic trends in Maryland, the ability to retrench during times of poor tobacco prices was a definite advantage of wealthier planters.

Precise land use patterns at Oxon Hill Manor cannot be determined from the documentation. Except for 1727, when no

hogs were listed, the estate raised cattle, horses, sheep, and hogs. In 1765 none of the 66 sheep were kept at the Great House. The decline in total cattle from 289 in 1727 to 50 in 1765 and 94 in 1775 indicates a decline in their importance. It may also reveal greater diversification, since wheat appears in only the 1765 and 1775 inventories. With such large numbers of slaves listed at the manor house, 23 in 1727, 24 in 1765, and 60 in 1775, it can be assumed that quarters were located near the house. Typical slave quarters would have included garden patches and, possibly, animal compounds. The mansion itself would have had some kind of animal compounds and stables, especially for Thomas Addison's coach horses in 1775. Housing for the omnipresent poultry would also be necessary (MHR, Inventories, 1727, 1765, 1775).

The best indication of eighteenth century land use and labor patterns derives from two court cases and an associated plat of Oxon Hill Manor from 1785. The following discussion of the court proceedings and the plat sheds light on occupancy patterns, leasing arrangements, estate management, land use, and slavery at Oxon Hill Manor from 1776 to 1793.

In 1775, one year after Oxon Hill Manor had been bequeathed by Thomas Addison to his five-year old son, Walter Dulany Addison, the estate leased approximately 100 acres to John Clifford. The trustees of the estate, Thomas's brother John Addison and Overton Carr, leased 39 acres of land at the ferry site along Oxen Creek and opposite Alexandria (See Figure 6), along with approximately 61 additional acres, for a total of about 100 acres. The entire 100-acre lease area contained a ferry house, a fishing house, and a fishery, although the documentation does not indicate their exact location. The 1775 deed refers to the leasehold, costing £120 annually, as a "plantation." The lease provided for some cutting of wood on the rented land and it was to run for a term of 11 years. The presence of John Clifford at the ferry site explains the subsequent references in other deeds to "Clifford's Ferry" on the Oxon Hill Manor property (MHR, Land Records, 662, P. 215, Dec. 26, 1775; MHR, Chancery Papers, 128, 1784-1785). In 1782 Monica Clifford, probably John's wife, received a license to operate a tavern at "Addison's Ferry." Gray Douglas was awarded the same license in 1788 (Van Horn, 1976, pp. 184-185, 204-205).

In 1776 Rebecca Addison, Thomas's widow, granted power of attorney to her brother-in-law, John Addison, and to Overton Carr. In her arrangement with Addison and Carr she

empowered them to collect all rents, to sell her livestock and crops at the appropriate times, and to contract for the crops to be grown on her "several plantations" in Prince George's County (MHR, Land Records, CC2: p. 268, Dec. 11, 1776). Also in 1776, John Addison leased "Hart Park," a 618 acre tract of Oxon Hill Manor, as his brother had requested in his 1774 will. John appears to have awaited the death of their mother, Susanna Addison, who had been living at Hart Park when Thomas died in 1774. John was to pay only £40 per year for the lease, which was to run for 16 years (to 1792) (MHS, Land Records, CC2: p. 302, Sept. 16, 1776).

Rebecca Addison owned a total of 96 slaves in Prince George's County in 1776, 67 at the Oxon Hill Manor house and 29 at "Mrs. Addison's Quarter" (location unknown--next to her brother-in-law, Anthony Addison). She was one of the largest slaveholders on the Potomac River side of Prince George's County, the area included in the 1776 census (the Patuxent River side of the county was not included) (Brumbaugh, 1915, Vol. 1).

Shortly after Rebecca Addison's second marriage to Thomas Hawkins Hanson in 1778, she and her new husband initiated legal proceedings against the estate. The suit noted that Rebecca had never been assigned her dower, a one-third share of all personal and real property owned by her late husband, to which she was legally entitled. The

proceedings indicated that her children were living with and being cared for by her and her husband, and that she was deriving some income from the Oxon Hill estate to cover these expenses. The court appointed John Addison to act as guardian for the children in this case, and in his testimony John declared that the estate was earning little or no profits. Rebecca and Thomas Hanson explained that the lack of profitability of the estate was, in fact, the main reason for their suit. John Addison raised no objection to the request for the formalized dower, and in 1783 Addison neighbors Henry Rozer and Leonard Marbury awarded Rebecca Hanson 828 acres of the estate, including the house (See Figure 6) (MHR, Chancery Paper 128, 1784-85).

The estate which Rebecca's son, Walter Dulany Addison, had inherited in 1774, totaled 3,663 acres (See Figure 5). At some point before 1782 John Addison was given 100 .75 3/4 acres, thereby reducing Oxon Hill Manor to 3,562 .25 1/4 acres. Walter had also received 54 acres of "Force," bringing his total estate to 3,616 .25 1/4 acres. The 828 acre dower was considered by Rozer and Marbury to be one-third the value of Walter's 3,616 .25 1/4 acres (MHR, Chancery Records 13, p. 516, May 20, 1782; MHR, Chancery Paper, 128, 1784-1785). Rebecca also received one-third shares, by value, of the estates of two of her other sons --John and Thomas Addison-- as well as £24 annually from the £120 per year lease to John Clifford.

Since the 39-acre ferry site rented by Clifford was not included in the dower (See Figure 6), Clifford's other 61 acres must have been in the dower area for the arbitrators to have granted Rebecca part of the annual rent.

In 1784-1785 the estate became embroiled in a more serious legal battle when Overton Carr, now Walter Dulany Addison's guardian, charged the Hansons and their tenants (Leonard Marbury and Nicholas Lowe) with "waste and destruction" of the wooded areas of Oxon Hill Manor. Figure 6 (dotted lines) indicates that the Hansons were leasing most of the 828-acre dower by this time. The leases included: 35 acres of cleared land and five acres of the 147 1/2 acre wooded unit (NW area) to Nicholas Lowe; an unspecified "small" acreage to a Mr. Edelen; about 61 acres to John Clifford (part of the 100 acres he leased in 1775); and 58 1/4 acres of woodland plus approximately 530 acres, including the 89-acre "cleared hills . . . house, garden, orchards and land not arable," to Leonard Marbury. The 58 1/4 acre figure written in the legal proceedings may be an incorrect figure which should have been 580 or 588 1/4 acres. This suggestion is based on the fact that the Hansons reserved only about 200 acres -- the "ashen swamp" areas -- of the 828-acre tract for their own use, leaving 628 acres leased. If the figure was 580 1/4 acres, the "small" part leased to Mr. Edelen may have been about eight acres.

The leasing situation is made more complicated, however, by the fact that about 61 acres were rented to John Clifford (the 39-acre ferry site was not part of the dower).

To summarize, by 1785 the Hansons were leasing about 628 acres of the 828-acre dower to at least four persons: Leonard Marbury, Nicholas Lowe, Mr. Edelen, and John Clifford. Although the acreages are not certain, Leonard Marbury was renting the manor house and possibly a total of over 500 acres. If not, then substantial acreage was being rented to unnamed tenants. Statements by Castle (1957) and Stoeckel (1958, p. 21) that the Oxon Hill Manor house was rented to Nathaniel Washington, a relative of George Washington, from 1785 or 1787 to 1792, appear to be incorrect. The leasing situation on Walter Dulany Addison's lands, the remaining 2,734 25/100 acres (3,562 25/100 minus the 828 acre dower), is not known for this period. A careful examination of land records for Prince George's County revealed no leasing information on Walter Dulany Addison for these years.

Marbury's principal use of the leased land was apparently to grow tobacco. He and Nicholas Lowe got into difficulty with Overton Carr because they were timbering their lands and selling the wood for income (Walter would inherit the land on the death of his mother). Marbury and Hanson defended this action as necessary to open up fresh

ground for tobacco crops, owing to the fact that currently cleared land was "worn out" from previous tobacco crops. Marbury had cleared about eight acres of a 58.25 acre wooded tract adjoining the swamp along the Potomac River, and Hanson argued that Marbury would have to continue to clear 11 or 12 acres annually. If not, he asserted, profits on the dower land would be "exceedingly reduced." Lowe's lease allowed him to timber one-third of the five wooded acres he was renting in each of the first three years of his five year lease. He had cleared only 0.5 acre by early 1785.

Marbury and Hanson also justified clearing the land by pointing to the need for lumber on the estate. They indicated that a number of houses and buildings needed repair, including two tobacco houses, and that the estate needed a new tobacco house and a good deal of fencing. They also wanted wood for making hogsheads to transport the cured tobacco. Marbury's "overseer and manager," Lancelot Wade, testified that 23 walnuts and wild cherries had been cut recently on the estate, along with some firewood near the manor house. He also indicated that Marbury was employing 17 slaves on his leasehold, five of whom were rented, and that Marbury had planted corn and enough acreage to produce 140 bushels of wheat. Although agreeing with Marbury and Hanson that new land was needed for tobacco, he contradicted

himself by asserting that the land already cleared would be adequate if it were properly manured.

Marbury's lease did not include the "ashen swamp" along the Potomac River. This area, and apparently the "ashen swamp" along Oxen Creek (See Figure 6), was the approximately 200 acres reserved by Hanson for uses not specified in the documents. At least five acres of the land along the Potomac was meadow land, and Hanson was planning to fence the entire swamp area. The estate contained a second landing at the south end of this swamp, apparently in or near the wooded 50.25 acres adjoining Henry Rozer's lands (See Figure 6). The landing may have been at or near the mouth of the Susquehanna River (See Figures 5 and 6). Marbury's lease allowed him to build a ferry house, two ferry boats, and a granary, and to make other improvements at the landing. He paid 350 pounds annually for the lease. Although it was dated September 10, 1784, the lease was to begin on January 1, 1785. Marbury was apparently timbering his lands before 1785, however, since testimony by Henry Rozer in early 1785 indicated that Marbury had cut 300 - 400 cords of poplar, white oak, and other trees by this time (MHR, Chancery Papers 128, pt. 1784-1785).

Specific uses of the dower land are not spelled out in the documents. The 1785 map suggests that the 89 acre unit around the manor house was used for gardens and orchards but

not for crops: "the cleared hills, including the house, garden, orchards and land not arable." References to tobacco houses and to the need for an additional tobacco house suggest that tobacco production may have been expanding. This assertion is supported by the fact that the tenants wished to clear additional fresh land for tobacco. References to wheat acreage and to possibly building a new granary indicate some interest in wheat production. The "overseer and manager," Lancelot Wade, referred to the need for additional fencing to enclose crops and pasture. The documents do not inform us of the extent of livestock holdings at Oxon Hill Manor at this time, but the fencing of pasture indicates that the estate did not completely follow the common practice of allowing livestock to forage for food. Presumably, the estate also had to have adequate housing for Marbury's 17 slaves and, possibly, for his overseer by this time. The fact that Walter Dulany Addison gradually reduced his slaveholdings in the 1790s suggests that the outbuildings listed in a 1798 Federal Tax Assessment had been built before Walter moved into the manor house in 1793.

Leonard "Luke" Marbury was an average slaveowner in 1776, owning 11 slaves. By 1785, at age 40, he owned 12 slaves but was able to rent five others. By 1793-94 he owned 28 slaves, although by this date he was no longer

leasing the manor house at Oxon Hill (MHR, Prince George's County, Assessment Records, 1793-94, hereafter cited as MHR, Assessments). Nicholas Lowe owned eight slaves in 1776, expanding this total to 18 by 1793-94. Marbury and Lowe owned £830 and £746 ~~pounds~~ in personal property, respectively, in 1793-94, making both of them very well-to-do if not extremely wealthy men. Zachariah Berry, who would buy Oxon Hill Manor in 1810, owned 53 slaves and £1541 personal property at his estate in Collington Hundred in 1793-94. Thomas Hanson owned 15 slaves £753 total personal property in Piscataway and Hynson Hundreds in 1793-94, although he may have held additional property elsewhere. The same can be said for the other property owners mentioned here (MHR, Assessment, 1793-94).

Before summarizing the discussion of land use and labor patterns at Oxon Hill Manor, a final word regarding occupancy at the estate after 1774 is in order. Available records suggest that Rebecca Addison operated the estate through her brother-in-law, John Addison, and Overton Carr until her marriage to Thomas Hawkins Hanson in 1778. Letters from "Oxon Hill" in 1781 and 1782 and the legal proceedings after 1778 confirm Rebecca's presence at the estate, although a 1788 letter from Rebecca to her brother, Walter Dulany, referring to the death of the old gardener, Mr. Oldney, would seem to contradict the data on leasing

(Murray, 1895, pp. 56, 72, MHR, Addison Family Papers). It seems certain that they occupied the estate until at least 1783, the year in which Hanson's uncle, John Hanson, president of the Continental Congress of the United States under the Articles of Confederation since 1781, died at Oxon Hill. Hanson had come to Oxon Hill for rest and seclusion, according to Newman (1940, p. 256).

Members of the John Hanson Society have explored the possibility that Hanson was buried at Oxon Hill, either in the Addison cemetery or in a mausoleum near the house. This has not been determined, and interested readers can consult the society or the files of the Maryland Historical Trust in Annapolis for additional information (Oxon Hill Manor, Maryland Historical Trust, Annapolis; Library of Congress, Miscellaneous Manuscript Collection, Manuscript Division, 1892 Typescript on John Hanson by J. Thomas Scharf). A final sidelight on the John Hanson relationship to Oxon Hill Manor is the fact that his wife, Jane Contee Hanson, was the great granddaughter of Colonel John Addison, via a route begun by his marriage to Rebecca Dent in 1677 (Stoeckel, 1958, p. 24).

Available information on land use and labor at Oxon Hill Manor permits little more than a general understanding. Tobacco was the cash crop. Slaves were numerous at least until 1776, but their number at the manor house appears to

have declined when Marbury rented the property in 1785. Whereas Thomas Addison had 60 slaves at the house in 1775 and Rebecca Addison 67 in 1776, Marbury owned only 12 and rented five in 1785. Since Thomas Hanson owned only 15 slaves in 1793, the fate of Rebecca Hanson's 16 slaves listed in the 1776 census is unclear. Tenants at the estate other than Marbury owned slaves, but it is improbable that they were housed near the site area. The 1790 census lists Walter Dulany Addison as the owner of 20 slaves, but the location of the slaves is not indicated. Since Addison was not living at Oxon Hill in 1790 it is again improbable that his slaves would have been there (1790 Census, Maryland).

C. MARYLAND SINCE THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Introduction

In sharp contrast to the depth of research on colonial Maryland, the history of Maryland since the Revolution remains somewhat superficial. Historians must rely on general studies by Craven (1965), Gray (1941), Walsh and Fox (1974) and various others for an understanding of trends in social, economic, and political history. Apart from excellent studies of Baltimore, only the works of Marks (1979) on St. Mary's County and McCauley (1973; 1977) on

Prince George's County explore basic social and economic themes in any depth. Consequently, establishing a contextual framework for the evolution of Oxon Hill Manor after the Revolution has required a good deal of primary analysis of one of the more valuable and accessible sources: the census records. This chapter offers a general evaluation of social and economic trends in Maryland since the Revolution, followed by a more in-depth analysis of Prince George's County and of the Oxon Hill Manor site and region. Census data on population, slavery, and agriculture has been used to examine demographic trends, slaveholding and other labor patterns, the economic and social consequences of emancipation, and changes in agricultural systems.

Decline and Adjustment, 1783-1860

1. Agriculture

Agricultural trends in antebellum Maryland remain obscure, in part owing to the difficulty of measuring agricultural change before the 1840 federal census. The basic historical interpretation of the period from the Revolution until the Civil War follows Craven and Gray, although some of the more recent scholarship has begun to

challenge their generalizations. Contemporary observers and the older historians described Maryland agriculture as declining, or at best stagnating, through most of the period from the Revolution to 1840. Problems created by the Revolution, Jefferson's embargo of 1807-1809, the War of 1812, the depression of 1819-1822, and the later Panic of 1837 all contributed to an unstable, uncertain producing and marketing environment. Poorly developed transportation, at least until the 1830s, isolated farmers in Piedmont and Western Maryland, the Hessian fly often devastated wheat crops, and poor farming methods exhausted the soil and lowered yields. Not until the 1830s and especially the 1840s did agricultural reform, improved transportation, and higher staple prices generate a revival of the agricultural economy. By 1860, the argument goes, Maryland farming was improving and growing rapidly (Craven, 1965: pp. 32-120; Gray, 1941: Vols. 1 and 2, passim; Gates, 1960: pp. 1-5, 100-107; Mitchell and Muller, 1979: pp. 23-25; DiLisio, 1983: pp. 146-147; Gutheim, 1949: pp. 104-159; Walsh and Fox, 1974: pp. 176-209).

Perhaps none of the obstacles to agricultural growth has received the attention afforded soil exhaustion, the factor stressed most strongly in Craven's classic study, discussed previously. Craven argued that continuous planting of tobacco until the soil was exhausted had, since the colonial period, ruined

the soils of Tidewater Maryland and Virginia. Tobacco farmers typically grew tobacco on a given acreage for three or four years, planted corn or wheat for one or two years, then abandoned the area. Unlike their European counterparts, American farmers failed to manure or otherwise fertilize the soil, to utilize deep or contour plowing, to follow crop rotation systems, or to establish hedgerows. Under frontier conditions such behavior made short-run economic sense, but population growth in the Tidewater area had drastically reduced available lands -- even before the American Revolution. Not until 1820, and especially after 1840, according to Craven, did American farmers adopt productive agricultural methods (Craven, 1965: pp. 32-110).

As the obstacles to agricultural change listed earlier would indicate, soil exhaustion and population pressure were only part of the story. Tobacco prices, for example, tended to be chronically low before 1850, despite occasional short-term rises such as during the few years after the War of 1812 (Gray, 1941: Vol. 2: p. 765; Marks, 1979: p. 66). Fluctuations before 1776 tended to be extreme, but prices generally rose. The bottom fell out, however, in the early 1770s. Prices fell rapidly from 1771 to 1775, creating so much distress in the tobacco areas of Maryland and Virginia that Jacob Price believes low prices may have contributed to revolutionary discontent (Price, 1980: pp. 128-137).

According to Walsh and Fox, soil exhaustion, debts, and other problems were so severe for Maryland tobacco planters by 1776 that "...only a handful of planters made any money from tobacco." Late eighteenth century planters began converting to wheat, although not in southern Maryland, and the larger planters turned increasingly to money-lending and leasing to tenants in order to maintain incomes (Walsh and Fox, 1974: 81; Gray, 1941: 407). One historian notes that the difficult times in the late eighteenth century enhanced the role of Potomac fisheries. They were becoming "of considerable commercial importance," he declared, "and an even more significant source of income to the waning tobacco plantations along the river" (Gutheim, 1949: pp. 104-159).

The American Revolution disrupted Maryland's agricultural economy, but in a manner not well understood by historians. Planters lost slaves, loyalists lost their property and all farmers endured inflation and wartime taxes. Wheat prices rose because of the greater demand for foodstuffs, encouraging many farmers to convert to wheat. Wheat production clearly expanded in Western Maryland, but the trend on the Western Shore is not clear. Joseph Scott, an observer in 1807, noticed some decline in tobacco production in favor of wheat on the Western Shore (Scott, 1807: pp. 47-45), and Bayly Marks confirms this strong tend

for St. Mary's County (1979). Marks' important work will be discussed later.

The impact on Maryland's tobacco industry of the abolition of the French tobacco monopoly in 1792 is not yet understood, although the demand for American foodstuffs was expanded by the French Revolution (Gray, 1941): Vol. 2, pp. 602, 605). Gray argues that the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century witnessed a general trend away from staples toward more general farming. He notes that the abolition of primogeniture, entail, and quitrents served to commercialize land and to generate waves of speculation between 1783-1800, 1812-1819, and 1830-1837. Many planters sold their plantations, their slaves, or both, or simply pulled out and migrated west (Gray, 1941: Vol. 2: pp. 613-647, 752-775, 908-918).

The tobacco staple clearly lost much of its colonial-period predominance after 1783, but its decline varied from region to region. In general, tobacco production moved away from the old Tidewater areas of Maryland and Virginia toward Piedmont Virginia and North Carolina, and toward newly-opening states such as Kentucky. Planting on fresh lands produced yields too high for most of the older areas to compete against (Gray, 1941: Vol. 2: pp. 108-118; Robert, 1938: pp. 15-31).

Poor prices, Western competition, soil exhaustion, and

the American Revolution were not the only factors disrupting Maryland's agricultural economy. During Jefferson's embargo of 1807-1809, Maryland exports fell from $14 million annually to $2 million, rising to only $6 million from 1809-1812. The British blockade of the Chesapeake saw exports fall to $3 million in 1813 and to $200,000 in 1814. Any gains after the war were limited by the ravages of the Hessian fly and by the severe depression of 1819-1822. Inadequate transportation limited access to markets and lack of capital hindered reform (Walsh and Fox, 1974: pp. 176-209).

Historians generally agree that Maryland's agricultural economy was "stagnant, if not regressive" at least into the 1820s. Travelers and other observers consistently reported on the dreary, depressed, desolate appearance of the rural Tidewater areas (Gates, 1960: p. 5; Mitchell and Fowler, 1979: pp. 23-24; Walsh and Fox, 1974: pp. 185-186). Many of the rivers and creeks had silted up, forcing Maryland river towns like Piscataway and Bladensburg into severe decline (Scott, 1807: pp. 127-128; Reps, 1972: p. 243). Most of the older areas of Maryland and Virginia witnessed serious emigration of white residents, and some lost slaves as well. Maryland's population grew by only 127,000 from 1790 to 1830, and Baltimore accounted for 53 percent of that. The population of Southern Maryland barely remained stable

during those years, losing over 6,000 whites but gaining in slaves (Mitchell and Muller, 1979: p. 25; Netherton, et al. 1978: pp. 161-165, 262-270; Low, 1951: pp. 122-125; Strickland, 1794, p. 49).

Within this decline, however, arose a strong agricultural reform movement. Although this movement has been well studied by historians, the overwhelming orientation of research has been on the organization and intellectual aspects of reform, not on the practical impact of reform ideas. Rather than examining agriculture <u>per se</u>, these historians have traced the movement back to the founding fathers--Washington, Jefferson, and Madison especially--and have greatly praised their efforts and those of nineteenth century reformers such as Edmund Ruffin, John Taylor, John Hartwell Cocke, and others (Craven, 1965, passim; Gates, 1960, :107-110; Gray, 1941, : Vols. 1 and 2, passim; Herndon, 1978, : pp. 394-406; Robert, 1938, : pp. 15-31; Wiser, 1963, : passim; Wiser, 1969, : pp. 105-132).

While these works are informative and valuable, they do not provide much assistance in our efforts to understand how planters and farmers responded to the difficulties of the years before 1840. Which of the many obstacles may have been predominant is uncertain, as is the interaction among them over time. From colonial studies of the Eastern Shore and of All Hallow's Parish, it is evident that planters were

flexible in substituting wheat for tobacco when prices declined. After the Revolution, tobacco appears to have lost its dominance, but years of high prices probably encouraged renewed planting. As will be seen later, we do have some data on trends in Prince George's and St. Mary's counties. In general, however, it is clear that the greater economic growth before 1840 occurred in the grain and livestock areas of Western Maryland and around Baltimore, where increased dairying, haying, and market gardening spurred agricultural expansion. Until 1830, however, the general agricultural economy remained stagnant (Mitchell and Muller, 1979: 24).

Just as most historians accept the notion of a general agricultural decline from 1783 to 1830-1840, they accept Craven's and others' assertions that Maryland experienced an economic renewal between 1830 and the Civil War. The agricultural reform movement launched by wealthy planters in the eighteenth century, the argument goes, slowly spread to smaller farmers and, combined with improved transportation, population growth, higher prices, industrial expansion, and new markets, regenerated Maryland's long-suffering agricultural economy. There seems little reason to dispute this interpretation. Table 5 reveals the rapid growth in agricultural production in Maryland after 1840, although the greatest gains occurred in the 1850s. The year 1850 marked

the first comprehensive collection of agricultural statistics. More enlightening for this report, however, is to establish, first, the regional variations in agricultural growth in Maryland before the Civil War and, second, the form that growth took in Prince George's County and in the Oxon Hill Manor area. This section examines the first topic. The second will be studied in a later section.

While accepting the long-standing general thesis of an agricultural revival after 1830 or 1840, historians more recently are modifying this interpretation by pointing to regional variations. By mid-century, the newer works argue, progress in Maryland economic life had had a clearly differential impact in the state and had produced four distinctive regions. Northwestern, or Western Maryland, had advanced most rapidly. Eight counties, including Baltimore County, produced half of the state's wheat and one-third of its corn and oats. A typical Western Maryland farmer "was worth more, produced more, and used more agricultural machinery per acre" than his counterparts in other parts of the state (Baker, 1973: 8). Outside Baltimore, Western Maryland benefited most from transportation improvements. Most significant were the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, both of which began construction in 1828. By the 1840s Western Maryland was connected to Baltimore, thereby opening markets not only for

its agricultural products, but also for coal and iron. By 1860, Western Maryland attracted 42 percent of the state's investment capital and produced one-third of Maryland's industrial output (Baker, 1973: p. 8; Friis, 1968a: pp. 148-149; Evitts, 1974: pp. 5-7; Walsh and Fox, 1974: pp. 188-189, 212-218; Gates, 1960: pp. 107-115).

Superseding the growth of Western Maryland was the city of Baltimore. From a small but growing town of 7,000 in 1776, Baltimore had expanded to 15,000 by 1795, making it the nation's fifth largest city, to 31,500 by 1800, and to 170,000 by 1850 (Reps, 1972: pp. 281-195; DiLisio, 1979: p. 147). Tobacco exports spurred Baltimore's growth in the 1790s, but wheat and flour came to dominate in the nineteenth century. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, along with additional transportation links to Washington, D.C., Delaware, and the northeastern cities, made Baltimore one of the nation's predominant ports by 1860. Industrial growth matched agricultural improvement. By 1860 Baltimore had over 1,100 industrial establishments employing over 20,000 workers, many of them the new European immigrants. The new population in the city also generated a heavy demand for foodstuffs, and dairying, orchard production and truck farming sprang up around the city after 1830 (Baker, 1973: pp. 11-12; DiLisio, 1979: pp. 146-151; Mitchell and Muller,

1979; pp. 25-38; Friis, 1968a; pp. 17-23; Reps, 1972, pp. 148-149; Evitts, 1974; pp. 5-7; Browne, 1980; passim; Walsh and Fox, 1974; pp. 188-189, 212-218).

A third region, the Eastern Shore, experienced significantly less economic change. Population grew little or not at all in the area, and by 1850 no town exceeded 2,000 persons. The home of Maryland's least prosperous farmers, the Eastern Shore produced vegetables, fruits, and grains for export, but tended toward a self-conscious isolationism which gave way to occasional threats to secede from the state. Neither commerce nor industry experienced significant growth on the Eastern Shore before the Civil War (Baker, 1973; pp. 9-10).

Occupying an intermediary position between the stagnant Eastern Shore and the dynamic areas of Baltimore and Western Maryland, Southern Maryland experienced some agricultural revival within the traditional tobacco-dominated economy. The area maintained a slaveholding and rural orientation, although tobacco appears to have yielded some ground to wheat and other crops within certain subregions. The changes within Prince George's and St. Mary's counties will be examined later. In general, however, the old plantation stereotype of "extensive fields worked by slaves, scattered stately homes, and the dominance of the land by one family..." was prevalent enough to allow parts of Southern

Maryland to "be mistaken for the deep South black belt" (Evitts, 1974: p. 9). Tables 6 and 7 reveal the extent to which slavery persisted in Southern Maryland by comparing Maryland, the South and regions of the South, South Carolina, and the five counties of Southern Maryland between 1790 and 1860.

Slaveholding in Southern Maryland was stable or increased among the counties, while falling precipitously in the state as a whole. Slavery as a percentage of total population was almost as high in Prince George's County as in South Carolina. Slaveholding in Charles County was higher than in South Carolina, although the data does not measure county-level differentials in South Carolina. In 1860, Southern Maryland held only seven percent of Maryland's white population and almost half of its slaves. Most slaves produced tobacco, although some were engaged in raising wheat, corn, oats, and other crops (Baker, 1973: pp. 11). While economic growth may have lifted some regions out of their doldrums, the area as a whole apparently presented the image of "a colonial world grown old and beginning to decay." Referring to Annapolis, a town of only 3,011 persons in 1850, a Maryland editor wrote in 1854 that the city, "which was in by-gone days the seat of fashion of the Union, has degenerated into one of the most dreary, dull, and monotonous places on earth" (Evitts, 1974: pp. 9-10).

2. Slavery

As Table 6 indicates, slavery declined in Maryland, as in the Border States or Upper South generally, while it rose in the Lower South. This can be explained in part by the general trend in the Upper South toward more mixed farming, as a combination of tobacco, wheat, corn, grains, hay, hemp and livestock replaced tobacco alone as the dominant crop. Farms tended to shrink in size and free wage labor increasingly replaced slave labor. By contrast, the Lower South tended to emphasize staple-crop production for export, usually cotton, rice, or sugar. Crops were raised by large gangs of slaves on large plantations (Mitchell, 1972, pp. 740-742).

The association between mixed farming, small farms, and free, usually white, wage labor, and between staple-crop production, plantations and slave labor is an essentially accurate generalization on the basic characteristics of antebellum agriculture in the South. Recent research, however, cautions against overly-simplified application of this generalization. In an excellent study of agriculture in St. Mary's County, Southern Maryland, Bayly Marks points out that tobacco began to give way to wheat as the county's cash crop immediately following the American Revolution. By

1790, wheat was already seen as "an alternative or supplemental crop to tobacco (Marks, 1979)." Owing to relatively better wheat prices than tobacco prices and to the all-important growing Baltimore market, St.Mary's County was able to convert much of its tobacco production to wheat. The expansion of wheat, however, did not occur evenly throughout the county. Rather, wheat was grown where soils were appropriate. By 1840 the county demonstrated substantial regional variations in the dominance of tobacco or wheat, although tobacco still predominated over wheat in the county as a whole.

Equally important to our understanding of antebellum agriculture was the fact that the increased emphasis on wheat did not diminish the importance of slavery in St. Mary's County. In the First District of the county, where wheat production was highest, 88 percent of all farmers owned slaves. The district average slaveholding was six slaves, the same as in the tobacco-dominant Fourth and Fifth Districts (Marks, 1979, p. 153). Tobacco planters held the largest numbers of slaves, although slave ownership tended to decline more rapidly among small tobacco producers than among small wheat producers. In fact, among tenants, tobacco producers rarely owned or hired slaves while wheat producers commonly owned or hired slave labor. By 1840 fewer tobacco farmers than wheat farmers owned slaves. The

conversion to wheat, Marks asserts, aided the perpetuation of slavery in the county (Marks, 1979: pp. 249-250, 419).

Marks also helps to clarify the impact of migration on the agricultural economy and on the racial distribution of population. The emigration of whites, dominated by poor tenants, outpaced the emigration of slaves. Although slaves as a percentage of total population remained roughly stable, the proportion of households owning slaves increased to 60 percent by 1840. Slaves, land, and other forms of wealth, however, became increasingly concentrated over time. By 1840, for example, 66 percent of all householders were tenants. Most were concentrated in the tobacco areas, although tenancy was common throughout the county. Landowners were pushing up rents, slaves were becoming increasingly expensive, and tobacco area tenants were experiencing serious downward mobility (Marks, 1979, pp. 257-273, 355-357).

In a comparable study of Orange and Greene counties in Piedmont, Virginia, John Schlotterbeck finds trends similar to St. Mary's County. He indicates that these counties had begun to diversify toward wheat as early as the 1720s, and that by 1760 wheat had become an important secondary staple. While suffering most of the difficulties of post-Revolutionary agriculture, the two counties adapted to economic recession by diversifying even further and by

focusing on the local exchange of surplus rather than on export to urban or foreign markets. By 1815, the author continues, "mixed farming, characterized by a wide variety of crops and marketable products, self-sufficiency in food production," and some home manufacturing was the dominant agricultural system in the counties (Schlotterbeck, 1980, pp. 4, 38-62, 160-168).

As in St. Mary's County, moreover, agricultural diversification did not preclude the perpetuation of slavery. In Orange County, for example, the percentage of households owning slaves increased so that by 1850 seventy percent of all households owned slaves. While tenancy was less common here than along the Virginia Tidewater--17 percent of households--about 40 percent of tenants owned slaves. The farm workforce was approximately 75 percent slave (Schlotterbeck, 1980, pp. 63-65, 185-188). As in St. Mary's County, the perpetuation of slavery within a more diversified agriculture depended greatly on the hiring out of slaves during low-activity periods. Farmers hired slaves by exchanging them during harvest and other active periods, and slaveowners frequently hired slaves to nearby industrial or transportation operations. Slavery, Schlotterbeck concludes, adapted to the new agricultural economy of the region during a period of general stagnation. Although not providing details, he does suggest that slavery declined

after 1850 when transportation and other improvements began to alter the localized economy of the 1790-1850 period (Schlotterbeck, 1980, pp. 189-198, 301-312).

Both Marks and Schlotterbeck offer well-researched case studies of regional agricultural change from the Revolution until the years before the Civil War. Marks does not take her study beyond 1840, so the impact of agricultural reform in St. Mary's County is not addressed. Both studies, however, demonstrate that the general interpretation of antebellum Southern agricultural trends, while emphasizing decline and renewal, the close association between staple crops for export and slavery, and the marriage of free labor and mixed farming, must be approached with caution. The implications of these observations for Prince George's County and the Oxon Hill Manor region will be discussed in the appropriate sections of the 15 report.

3. Free Blacks.

One of the principal effects of agricultural decline or stagnation after the Revolution was a surplus of slaves. Coupled with the decline in tobacco production, the shift toward greater diversification reduced the size of slaveholdings or encouraged slaveowners either to sell slaves or to carry their slaves with them to new lands to

the West. While slavery adapted to mixed farming, the number of slaves tended to decline in many, but not all areas, or to decline until the agricultural revival after 1840 permitted slave growth again. In Southern Maryland the white and slave populations declined and increased at varying rates after 1860. By 1860 Prince George's, Anne Arundel, and Calvert counties showed small increases in the white population; Charles and St. Mary's showed declines. The slave population rose slightly in Calvert and Prince George's counties, but declined in Anne Arundel, Charles, and St. Mary's counties. Table 7 indicates the net results of these changes over the period from 1790 to 1860.

While Maryland's white population grew by 114.9 percent and its slave population declined by 15.4 percent from 1790 to 1860, the population of free blacks grew dramatically. Table 8 reveals that the free black population of Maryland rose from 1,817 in 1755 to 83,942 by 1860, the latter figure almost equaling the slave population, 87,189, by 1860. In Southern Maryland the free black population grew from 1,851 in 1790 to 10,837 by 1860, an increase of 485.5 percent. For the state as a whole the increase from 1790 to 1860 was 943.7 percent, from 8,043 to 83,942. By 1860 free blacks made up 12.1 percent of the population of Southern Maryland and 12.2 percent of population of the state. Clearly, the state as a whole had caught up to southern Maryland over the

years. Most of the growth occurred in Baltimore, where the free black population grew from 927 in 1790 to 29,911 by 1860, an increase of over 3,000 percent. In fact, Baltimore housed 35.6 percent of the entire free black population in 1860 (Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1870c: pp. 36-37; Wright, 1921, p. 88).

The population of free blacks grew dramatically. Table 8 reveals that the free black population of Maryland rose from 1,817 in 1755 to 83,942 by 1860, the latter figure almost equaling the slave population, 87,189, by 1860. In Southern Maryland the free black population grew from 1,851 in 1790 to 10,837 by 1860, an increase of 485.5 percent. For the state as a whole the increase from 1790 to 1860 was 943.7 percent, from 8,043 to 83,942. By 1860 free blacks made up 12.1 percent of the population of Southern Maryland and 12.2 percent of population of the state. Clearly, the state as a whole had caught up to Southern Maryland over the years. Most of the growth occurred in Baltimore, where the free black population grew from 927 in 1790 to 29,911 by 1860, an increase of over 3,000 percent. In fact, Baltimore housed 35.6 percent of the entire free black population in 1860 (Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1870c: pp. 36-37; Wright, 1921, p. 88).

The phenomenal growth of the free black population in Maryland has not been adequately explained by historians,

nor do we have any understanding of the social, economic, or political implications of this phenomenon. For example, the sheer number of free blacks in Maryland outstripped its nearest rival, Virginia, by 83,942 to 58,042. In Virginia, however, only 10.6 percent of all blacks were free, compared to 49.1 percent in Maryland. In North Carolina, which followed Virginia with 30,463 free blacks, the percentage was only 8.6 percent. While Maryland topped all states in total free blacks, the proportion of free blacks among all blacks was actually greater in Delaware, with 77.8 percent, and in the District of Columbia, with 91.7 percent (Berlin 1974: pp. 136-137).

The essential characteristics of free black life have been well researched by historians such as Berlin (1974), for the South generally, Franklin (1943), for North Carolina, and Jackson (1942), for Virginia. Various studies of slavery treat free blacks to some extent (Genovese, 1974: pp. 398-405). Marks (1979) discusses free blacks in St. Mary's County, Maryland before 1840, but our understanding of the growth and characteristics of free blacks in Maryland remains obscure. Studies of slavery and free blacks in Maryland by Wright (1921) and Brackett (1889) and on the District of Columbia by Brown (1972) are unsophisticated and superficial compared to the works of Berlin and others. In general, historians have not studied the reasons for the

expansion of the redundant free black population in a systematic manner. The poorer studies tend to explain its growth as the result of the popularity of liberal political philosophy and religious conscience following the American Revolution. Better studies expand on these factors to include the fact that the stagnant or declining economy after 1790 created a surplus of slaves which owners chose to get rid of by sale or manumission. The rate of growth was much greater between 1790 and 1830 than afterward, a fact explained by the increasing severity of both slavery and restrictions on free blacks after 1830. Most researchers note that individual slaveowners freed slaves within a generally hostile popular climate, even before 1830. Perhaps the most famous example was Robert Carter of Nomini Hall, Virginia. Carter decided to free 509 slaves, beginning in 1791 and continuing to 1812. His decision was very unpopular and severe criticism eventually influenced his decision to retire to Baltimore (Phillips, 1929: p. 226, Guthrie, 1949: p. 91).

Undoubtedly some combination of moral and economic factors caused the general expansion of the free black population after 1790. Only systematic and focused research will uncover dominant influences and reveal regional variations. Walsh and Fox, for example, point to three factors influencing Maryland's peculiar dominance: first, the less severe manumission regulations in practice in the

state; second, the rapid growth of demand for free labor in Baltimore; and, third, the well-developed self-help agencies, such as social clubs, benevolent societies, and the African Methodist Episcopal Church, in Maryland (Walsh and Fox, 1974: pp. 231-235). Berlin's fine study makes the same point about the phenomenon generally, but it also stresses the importance of both moral concerns and the economic need to get rid of surplus slaves (Berlin, 1974: pp. 30-31, 51-88). The economic argument is strongly reinforced by the fact that the free black population contained disproportionate numbers of older adults, especially women. Marks found this to be true in St. Mary's County in 1840 (Marks, 1979: p. 439). The economic argument is also bolstered by the fact that free blacks were disproportionately represented in the areas of Virginia and Maryland, where economic difficulties were most pronounced (Berlin, 1974: passim; Genovese, 1974: pp. 398-405; Wright, 1921: passim; Morris, 1948: pp. 385-387; Franklin, 1943: passim; Brackett, 1889: passim; Brown, 1972: pp. 42-77; Jackson, 1942: pp. ix-70; Gray, 1941: Vol. 2, p. 616; Papenfuse, 1972: pp. 306-307; Mitchell and Muller, 1979: p. 25; Walsh and Fox, 1974: pp. 219-220).

4. Antebellum Prince George's County

a. Agriculture

Writing for the American Farmer in 1819, the anonymous "Agricola" described the impact of tobacco on the lower counties of the Western Shore:

> Dreary and uncultivated waste, a barren and exhausted soil, half clothed negroes, lean and hungry stock, a puny race of horses, a scarcity of provender, houses falling to decay, and fences wind shaken and dilapidated...The cultivation of tobacco as a sole and entire crop has brought this scene to pass (American Farmer, Vol 1, 1819, pp. 98-99).

Tobacco, he continued, "starves the earth by producing but little litter, and it starves its cultivators by producing nothing to eat." The soil becomes "cadaverous" and the cultivators "squalid," Agricola moaned, all because the local farmers were too "unreflecting, unenterprising" to adopt sensible agricultural practices. Farmers should rotate crops, diversify away from tobacco, reduce slaveholdings, and become more like the model New England farmers. The Baltimore market for a variety of crops, he concluded, was ripe for the plucking (American Farmer, Vol. 1, 1819, pp. 98-99, 264-265).

Such was the opening shot of the American Farmer's first issue, published in Baltimore in 1819. It represented the views of the expanding agricultural reform movement in the Upper South, as yet unrepresentative of the overwhelming

majority of Southern Maryland farmers. The basic characteristics of agriculture in Prince George's County before 1840 are not clearly understood. Available research strongly suggests, however, that the county did not move toward greater diversification, as in St. Mary's County, but continued its traditional reliance on tobacco. Without information on production levels and local marketing patterns, it is impossible to determine whether or not tobacco's continued dominance may have operated within a diversifying pattern. The county probably retrenched into self-sufficiency and local exchange, perhaps along the lines of Orange and Greene counties in Virginia during this period, but researchers must expect that the growth of Washington, D.C. and Baltimore affected the county as they clearly would later. Still, the American Farmer of 1840 continued to complain about "the lethargy and supineness which overwhelm the agriculturalists of old Prince George's" (McCauley, 1973: pp. 20-21).

Donald McCauley, in the only available in-depth examination of Prince George's County between the Revolution and the Civil War, calculated that agriculture in the county did not begin to decline seriously until about 1790. By that time population pressure and destructive agricultural practices caused considerable soil deterioration. By 1807, many creeks and navigable rivers, such as the Anacostia,

were silting up and forcing commercial towns such as Piscataway and Bladensburg into decline (Papenfuse, 1972, pp. 269; Scott, 1807, p. 128-129; McCauley, 1973, pp. 38-43). Amid constant complaints of soil exhaustion and agricultural poverty, migration from the county became massive. Prince George's lost 12,299 white residents between 1790 and 1840, and the white population in 1840 was 2,181 lower than in 1790. In 1840 the county had only 78 males aged 16-25 per 100 females in the same age group (McCauley, 1973, pp. 46-52).

Within the county, the Potomac River side was more adversely affected than the Patuxent River side. Perhaps soil erosion and exhaustion was greater along the Potomac, causing a more rapid decline in yields. The Patuxent soils were not only the county's best tobacco soils, but the state's best tobacco soils, and yields may have held up better. Also, Scott points out, Potomac soils were ill-suited to wheat, making diversification less feasible. The most economically stable region of the county was in the Western Branch and Collington Hundreds (Election Districts 2 and 3, including 7 later), known at the time as "the rich forest lands of Prince George's County" (Scott, 1807, p. 122; McCauley, 1973, pp. 53-55). Western Branch and Collington Hundreds were the location of the estates of Zachariah Berry, owner of Oxon Hill Manor in 1840, and of

Thomas E. Berry, his grandson and future owner of the manor. In 1840 Thomas E. Berry, "apparently prospering and optimistic about the future," paid $60.25 per acre for 416 acres in Collington Hundred. The figure was one of the highest per acre prices in the state. From 1820 to 1840, Election District 3 (Queen Anne's, later Marlborough), lost only three percent of its white population; District 6 (Spaldings), where Oxon Hill Manor was located, lost 19.3 percent (McCauley, 1973: 64-67) (See Figure 11: I have no available map which shows the districts before District 3 was divided into Districts 2, 3, and 7).

Agricultural production data -- and therefore information on crop or livestock distribution -- is not available for Prince George's County before the 1840 agricultural census. The county's commitment to tobacco is demonstrated by its production of 9,259,423 pounds in 1839, a figure which was 48.9 percent of the state's total and almost three times the 3,265,271 pounds harvested by its nearest rival, Charles County. Production declined to 8,380,851 pounds in 1850, perhaps reflecting the fact that 1839 was an exceptional year. By 1859 production reached 13,446,550 pounds, although this was only 35.0 percent of the state's total (Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers, 1840; Maryland, National Archives; 1850a Census, pp. 225-228; 1860a Census, pp. 72-73).

Table 9 shows agricultural production levels of key crops and livestock, as well as the value of market gardening, orchard products, and dairy products. Most notable is the dominance of tobacco. Table 10 compares those categories which could be compared between 1840 and 1860. In 1860 Prince George's County was producing 34.8 percent of Maryland's tobacco, much more than any other county. The county produced only 5.3 percent of the corn and wheat in the state. While the significance of changes in all agricultural categories is impossible to determine, it appears that corn, hay, wheat, market gardening and, to a lesser extent, orchard production, all increased substantially after 1840. This suggests some diversification, but only within the continued domination of tobacco.

Table 11 reveals production levels within Prince George's County election districts in 1840. Oxon Hill Manor was located in District 6, Spaldings, as can be seen in Figure 11. Most striking is the low level of tobacco production compared to any of the other districts. The 91,198 pounds of tobacco was only 1.0 percent of county production, although District 6 contained 6.7 percent of the county's population. District 3 produced 44.4 percent of the county's tobacco while containing only 26.8 percent of the county population. In fact, the proportion of

agricultural production in District 6 was below its proportion of county population in every category. Such consistent levels suggest that the district was agriculturally depressed. Tobacco, which dominated the county, showed the lowest percentage of any category. (~~I am~~ assuming the zero values for market gardens, orchards, and dairy derive from an incomplete census).

By 1850, tobacco production in Spaldings, or District 6, had reached only 1.3 percent of the county total, although Prince George's was producing 39.1 percent of the state's total. Table 12 shows production levels for Maryland, Prince George's County, and Spaldings District in 1850. It lists more agricultural categories than previous tables because more information was taken by the censuses of 1850 to 1880. Most striking in 1850 is the high level for market gardening -- 21.5 percent of the county value. Given the low level for the county in relation to the state -- 6.6 percent -- Spalding's market gardening clearly reflects the impact of its proximity to Washington, D.C. Hay, suggesting dairying and livestock increased, and Irish potatoes also showed relatively high levels. The county as a whole did not demonstrate high production levels outside of tobacco. The 39.1 percent of the state total was much higher than the county's 3.7 percent of state population.

Table 13 shows the same data as Table 12 for the year

1860. The relative importance of tobacco in the county had declined, but only slightly, and the same occurred in Spalding's District. The most dramatic change developed in orchard production, increasing from 7.6 percent of county production to 56.1 percent. The county's absolute value of orchard production actually decreased, as did its proportion of state production. Spalding's also showed a substantial rise in market gardening, even though the county lost ground. Given the fact that the county contained 3.4 percent of the state's population but produced 35.0 percent of its tobacco, the dominance of tobacco in the county as a whole is very evident.

A final point regarding agricultural production is that the period from 1840 to 1860 witnessed substantial county-wide growth in some categories, notably tobacco, wheat, hay, corn, and market gardens. Comparing the more detailed 1850 and 1860 censuses (Tables 12 and 13), we see significant increases in the values of farms, farm implements, and livestock. This pattern suggests greater attention to wheat as a cash crop, requiring greater investments in implements and draft animals, but also continued emphasis on tobacco.

Within Spalding's we see significant increases from 1840 to 1860 in tobacco, hay, potatoes, wheat, market gardens, and orchard production. The relative importance of

tobacco, however, did not increase, suggesting an even more dramatic increase in the relative importance of market gardening and orchard production. Comparing the 1850 and 1860 censuses (Tables 12 and 13), we see substantial increases in the values of farms, farm implements, orchard products, and market gardening. Hay increased little, while butter, the value of animals slaughtered, and the value of livestock declined. Wheat, rye, and corn changed little, although oats increased. The pattern of change from 1850 to 1860 is one showing increased emphasis on cash crops -- tobacco, orchard products, market gardening, and potatoes. Oats gained importance while wheat production remained close to 1850 levels. Declines in livestock slaughtered and in butter production suggest less emphasis on dairying. Overall, the growth from 1840 to 1860 clearly supports Craven's assertion that Maryland's agricultural economy revived after 1840.

Donald McCauley's analysis of agricultural trends in Prince George's County from 1840 to 1860 led to his establishing three economic regions which he termed commercial, transitional, and tobacco zones. He found Election Districts 1 and 2, most accessible to Washington and Baltimore because of proximity or transportation facilities, to be most commercially oriented in that the two districts were both market oriented and less reliant on

tobacco as a sole cash crop. District 6, among others, was transitional, while District 3 and several others continued their heavy reliance on tobacco (McCauley, 1973, pp. 138-140). Additional analysis of agricultural trends in Maryland, Prince George's County and Spaldings District (Oxon Hill District in 1880) will be provided in a later section which compares antebellum and post-civil war patterns.

Continued reliance on tobacco is also revealed in land distribution in Prince George's county. Although average farm size declined as in Maryland generally after 1850 -- and probably earlier -- the average size in Prince George's was much higher than in the mixed farming areas. In 1860 the county's 263-acre average farm was 37.0 percent higher than the state's 192 acres, 52.0 percent higher than Northern and Western Maryland's 173 acres and 9.6 percent higher than Southern Maryland's 240 acres. Within the county the tobacco areas averaged 303 acres per farm, versus the commercial zone's average of 258 acres, a difference of 17.4 percent. The transitional zone averaged only 212 acres. It also showed significantly lower average land values and average value of farm implements -- both below county-wide averages (McCauley, 1973, p. 148; 1850 Census, 225-228; 1860 Census, pp. 72-73, 203, 231). This data reinforces the notion that District 6, Spaldings, as part of the

transitional zone was less prosperous than other parts of the county.

6. Slavery, Wealthholding and Free Blacks

Previous analysis has shown that slavery persisted in Southern Maryland to a much higher degree than in other parts of the state, and that the proportion of slaves within the population was more comparable to the Lower South than to the state itself. Table 14 reveals this pattern, and it also demonstrates that slaves as a percentage of total population did not actually change significantly after 1790. In fact, the number of slaves in 1860, 12,479, was only 1,303 greater than the 11,176 in 1790. The proportion was similar in both years because the white population actually decreased by 354 persons, from 10,004 in 1790 to 9,650 in 1860. Free black growth accounted for the difference, increasing from 164 in 1790 to 1,198 in 1860 (1870c Census, pp. 336-37). Despite apparently low growth rates, Prince George's county slaves increased from 10,636 in 1840 to 12,479 by 1860, a change of 17.3 percent. An 8.2 percent growth rate in the 1850's was higher than some slave regions of South Carolina and Georgia. Within the county, slave rates varied tremendously. By 1860, District 6, Spaldings, had only 59 slaves per 100 whites, compared to 281 in

District 3, Marlborough, and 304 in District 7, Queen Anne's. In fact, only District 1, Vansville, had a lower ratio than Spalding's in 1860 at 37 slaves per 100 whites. This was a pattern which had held true since at least 1820 (1820 Census; p. 22; 1830 Census; pp. 80-81; Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufactures, 1840, Maryland), and probably even earlier. It is also probable, however, that slavery had declined in the District 6 area relative to patterns in the more tobacco-oriented districts along the Patuxent River (McCauley, 1973; pp. 157-162).

Slaveholding in Prince George's County became increasingly concentrated after 1790, as did wealth generally. In 1800, 53.5 percent of households owned slaves; by 1860 only 35.1 percent owned slaves. Average slaveholdings per household did not change much, rising from 13.3 in 1800 to 14.7 in 1860. The state average was 6.3 slaves. The median slaveholding in 1860 Prince George's County was 25.0 slaves (1860f Census; p. 231) In 1860, however, the top 10 percent of all slaveholders owned nearly two-thirds (66.7 percent) of all slaves, versus 41.2 percent for the top 9.5 percent in 1800 (1800 Census; McCauley, 1973; pp. 210-216).

Available documentation points to a similar concentration of land and wealth after 1790, although the trend is only certain from 1840 to 1860. By 1860, nearly

two-thirds of all assessed acreage was owned by the top 10 percent of all landowners. Almost three-quarters of total assessed wealth (slaves, other personal property) was owned by the top 10 percent. Fully 60.7 percent of all households showed no assessed real estate, however, a figure which suggests a similar percentage of tenancy. Over half of all households, 51.2 percent, listed no assessed personal property. All of these figures indicate that the concentration of wealth increased after 1840, the period in which the county's economy was clearly growing. Average family assessments increased from $3,668 to $4,429 between 1840 and 1860, a change of 20.7 percent. District 3 (in 1860 Districts 3, 7, and part of 2), grew by 47.0 percent; District 6, Spalding's, by 9.8 percent, less than half the county average. Moreover, the acreage assessments per family in District 6 in 1860 was $2,062, only 21.2 percent of District 3's $9,707 (McCauley, 1973: pp. 212-217). Such figures strongly reinforce earlier statements that the Spalding's area was considerably less prosperous, despite some growth, than some other parts of the county by 1860. The average assessment in 1860 ($2,062) was lower than any other district, and only 46.6 percent of the county average ($4,429).

The somewhat unique expansion of the free black population in Maryland after 1790 has been commented upon

already. Table 15 shows that Prince George's County experienced the same trend, with an extremely rapid surge between 1800 and 1810. This jump has not been explained by historians; it suggests massive manumissions by a few large slaveholders in the manner of Robert Carter of Virginia. If the figure for 1810, 4,979, is valid, most of the newly-freed slaves must have left the county. By 1820 the county showed only 1,096 free blacks. Available data suggests that District 6 may have freed more of its slaves than any other district, at least by 1840. In that year, 13.3 percent of the district population was free black, versus 4.5 percent in District 3 and 5.5 percent for the county as a whole. By 1860 free blacks made up 5.1 percent of the county population, a figure which contrasts sharply with the 12.2 percent total for the state in 1860. Combined with Prince George's high population of slaves in 1860 -- 53.5 percent -- the relatively low free black proportion strongly reinforces evidence regarding the county's strong commitment to slavery before the Civil War.

5. Summary

Summarizing trends in agriculture, slavery, and wealthholding in Maryland and Prince George's County from 1790 to 1860, it is evident that both experienced a period

of decline or stagnation followed by a revival after 1830 or 1840. The impact of both decline and renewal varied significantly within the state and within the county. Western Maryland and Baltimore grew much more rapidly than Southern Maryland or the Eastern Shore. Better transportation, greater economic diversification, and earlier application of agricultural reform were some of the factors contributing to their more rapid development. Southern Maryland and Prince George's County remained wedded to the traditional tobacco staple, but less so in some regions. St. Mary's County added wheat as an important cash crop, and it did so without reducing the role of slave labor. Slave labor was also adapted to the mixed farming economy of Orange and Greene Counties, Virginia, during this period. This evidence suggests caution in associating tobacco and slavery too closely; that is, researchers should not assume that large numbers of slaves automatically indicates tobacco production in the Upper South.

Within Prince George's County the relative importance of slavery and tobacco, and the distribution of wealth, varied considerably. While data ~~is~~ are incomplete, it appears that Spalding's District, the location of Oxon Hill Manor, never emphasized slavery to the same extent as other areas. In 1783, for example, New Scotland, Oxon, and Bladensburg Hundreds contained only 34.9 percent slaves. Oxon Hundred

was the administrative unit for Oxon Hill Manor in 1783. By contrast, Western Branch and Collington Hundreds (later District 3, then Districts 3, 7 and part of 2), showed 64.2 percent of its population as slaves in 1783. The county average was 48.1 percent slaves (Kulikoff, 1976, pp. 532-533). In 1840 District 6 contained 32.9 percent slaves, versus 66.9 percent in District 3 and 54.4 percent for the county (1840 Population Census, Maryland). Figures for 1860 are not available, but the lack of importance given tobacco suggests that slavery had not increased relative to other districts. High rates of tenancy, known to exist in the later eighteenth century, appear to have continued in both District 6 and the county as a whole. Documentation consulted offers almost no data on tenancy before 1860. Lack of private papers and the tendency to arrange tenant agreements orally greatly limit potential research.

Agricultural Diversification and Farm Tenancy, 1860-1900

As for most areas of the South, our knowledge of social and economic trends in Maryland after the Civil War is extremely underdeveloped. According to one source, social and economic history of Maryland's post Civil War non-urban areas is the most-neglected aspect of Maryland's history (Mitchell and Muller, 1979, p. 41). Lack of regional

research notwithstanding, the expansion of statistical data collection permits very precise delineation of agricultural, demographic, and industrial trends after 1850. Tax assessment data can be used to supplement the censuses. The assessments are particularly valuable for showing individual holdings of real and personal property, including slaves until 1860. Tax assessment records for Prince George's County are excellent until 1850, at which date they become very incomplete until the 1890s.

Already in motion before the Civil War, the general trend in agriculture in the Upper South after the war was toward greater diversification. King Cotton took the Lower South toward greater than ever dependence upon a single staple; rice and sugar had a similar effect in certain areas. Another clear trend was the expansion of tenant farming arrangements, usually in the form of sharecropping or cash renting. Variations in tenant systems between and within regions of the South were considerable, but the general trend was unmistakable. Evidence on Oxon Hill Manor after the Civil War points to its eventual organization as some type of plantation employing tenants. Since information is not abundant, and since there is some uncertainty as to precise occupancy and land-use patterns on the estate, parts of the analysis must be considered speculation. Examining trends in agricultural production

and tenancy, however, is the best means to establish a comparative context for Oxon Hill Manor's development after 1860. The detailed 1850 agricultural census, along with tax assessments and other documentation, allows evaluation of some trends from before the Civil War. Since Oxon Hill Manor began to break up in the 1880s, and since the manor house burned in 1895, analysis of the estate after 1860 focuses on the years before 1895. Some comments on developments after that date are included, however.

1. General Trends in Maryland and the South

Table 16 shows the changes in agricultural production levels from 1860 to 1880, along with percentage changes between the censuses. It is striking to note that many items, such as the value of farms, farm implements, livestock, animals slaughtered, orchard products, and market gardens did not decline-- despite the Civil War. Historians point out that the war affected the state adversely only temporarily. Once the Union effectively occupied Maryland, agriculture actually received a boost in some areas due to federal demand for food. Emancipation certainly disrupted labor arrangements, however, as former slaves began flocking to Baltimore, Washington or other larger towns (Mitchell and Muller, 1979: pp. 38-40; Brackett, 1890: p. 25; Walsh and

Fox, 1974; p. 397). Improved acreage declined after 1860, but not dramatically. The greatest single decline was in tobacco production, which fell 59.0 percent during the decade. The most impressive growth was in orchard products and market gardening. Despite the war, this was a perpetuation of antebellum trends.

By 1880, most items had recovered to at least pre-Civil War levels. Tobacco, sweet potatoes, corn, and butter gained considerably, although the value of market gardens fell. The decline in market gardening, however, was temporary; by 1890 it had risen to $1,057,116, a 21 percent increase but still below 1870 levels (Table 16; 1890b Census: p. 514). Average farm acreage continued the downward trend begun before the Civil War. Between 1850 and 1880 average total acres per farm fell from 212 to 126; average improved acres declined from 128 to 83 (1850a Census: pp. 225-228; 1860a Census: pp. 72-73; 1870d Census: pp. 172-173; 1880a Census: p. 119).

The census figures reflect a general reorientation of Maryland's agricultural economy after the Civil War. The four basic changes were: reduced farm sizes, less reliance on traditional staples, increased investment in farm implements and machinery, and extended diversification into perishable products. Tobacco production was seriously hindered by labor-supply disruptions and wheat production by

competition from the West. Perishable fruits, vegetables, and dairy products became more economically feasible for those areas either close to urban markets or located near good transportation facilities. Fruit and vegetable production grew mostly in Prince George's and Anne Arundel Counties and on the Eastern Shore (Mitchell and Muller, 1979, pp. 41-42).

While information about agricultural trends in rural Maryland after the Civil War is available, it is superficial. The precise regional impact of the aforementioned changes is yet to be carefully studied. Industrial growth accelerated in parts of Western Maryland, especially in the coal-producing areas, and some processing of fruits, vegetables, and seafood developed around the Chesapeake. Most dramatic, however, was the continued growth and dominance of Baltimore. By 1900 the city contained two-fifths of the state's total population and one-third of the black population. Two-thirds of Maryland's industrial workers lived in Baltimore and three-fifths of all industrial production came from its industries. Moreover, most remaining industry was located in adjacent areas of Baltimore and Anne Arundel counties. The Baltimore metropolitan area contained over half of the state's population in 1900. Maryland's black population declined steadily in rural areas after 1860. By 1910 blacks made up

about 20 percent of rural populations, although Southern Maryland counties contained from 40 to 50 percent blacks (Mitchell and Muller, 1979, pp. 40-49).

Since the separation of owners and tenants in the census did not occur before 1880, development of tenant arrangements during and immediately after the Civil War is difficult to address statistically. Histories of the South, however, universally agree that tenancy tended to increase in most areas from the late 1860s into the current century. Newly-freed blacks strongly resisted efforts immediately after the war to replace antebellum slave gangs with black wage-labor gangs. Their opposition to such disguised slavery was effective, and landowners were forced to make land available to black farmers. Whites refused to sell land to blacks in most areas, and blacks lacked the resources for purchase in any event. Since confiscation of land was ruled out, blacks intending to stay on the farms had to become tenants, sharecroppers, or wage laborers--or some combination of these (Fite, 1984, pp. 2-15).

Historical literature on Southern tenancy and post-Civil War landholding is widely available, although many of the long-standing generalizations are being modified by regional studies. Moreover, there exists a clear-cut split between historians or historical economists who apply neo-classical models to post-Civil War agriculture and

historians who proceed more empirically. The former camp is dominated by Higgs (1977), Reid (1973), De Canio (1975), and Shlomowitz (1979); the latter looks to Mandle (1978), Ransom and Sutch (1977), Woodman (1977), and Wiener (1978,1979). Whatever the merit of their conclusions, the questions raised and the research conducted far exceed any comparable work done on post-Civil War Maryland. Most research on tenancy, it should be noted, has focused on the cotton-producing areas of the South.

Compared to landowning farmers, tenants tended to be relatively poorer, whether black or white. Images of total degradation derived from 1930s photographs and from such sources as H. L. Mencken, who described tenants as "perambulating test tubes for the culture of hookworms," should be approached with caution (Mendenhall, 1937, p. 127). As will be seen in the section on Prince George's County, not all tenants were poor. Such reservations should not detract from the general veracity of the image, however. Tangled in a web of debts which often approached peonage, and locked into single-crop production on often inferior and inadequate lands, tenants found themselves constantly skirting the edges of poverty. Farmers, too, struggled with debts, the ups and downs of international markets, periodic depressions, and inadequate transportation facilities. For complex reasons too detailed to be pursued here, Southern

farmers and tenants fell far behind their Northern and Western counterparts. Agricultural methods changed little between 1870 and 1930, exemplified in the fact that only 2 percent of Georgia and South Carolina farmers owned tractors in 1930 compared to 25 percent in Minnesota and 35 percent in Kansas (Fite, 1979: pp. 3-5, 15). By 1900, Gilbert Fite comments, "the South had become a land of predominantly small farms populated by poor people" (Fite, 1984: p. 15).

Rates of tenancy varied greatly among regions of the United States. Between 1880 and 1920, tenancy increased in the North from 19.2 percent of all farms to to 28.2 percent. In the West the change was from 14.0 percent to 17.7 percent. With by far the most tenant farms, the South increased from 36.2 percent tenancy in 1880 to 49.6 percent in 1920. In Maryland, tenancy rates were between Southern and Northern patterns. In 1880, 30.9 percent of all farmers were tenants. The rate peaked in 1900, at 33.6 percent, but declined to 28.9 percent by 1920. Most tenants, usually about two-thirds, operated on a share basis rather than on cash rent. This was the pattern for most areas and for the nation as a whole (Goldenweiser and Truesdell, 1924: pp. 23, 24, 145, 147).

2. Trends in Prince George's County and in Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts, 1850 - 1890

a. Prince George's County

After the Civil War, agriculture in Prince George's County diverged increasingly from its antebellum pattern and from the plantation counties of the Lower South. In 1860 tobacco had continued its domination within a plantation system of expanding slavery, although some farmers had turned to market gardening and dairying in the 1850s. Still, in 1860 Prince George's County was the number one tobacco producing county in the nation, and the census listed two farms over 1,000 acres and 61 over 500 acres. The Civil War had a similar impact on the county as in other parts of the South. It lost population and capital during the war, and the slave plantation system was left disorganized after the war as newly-freed slaves sought new labor arrangements or left the area. In 1870, the values of farm lands, farm implements and machinery, and livestock were 45 to 50 percent below 1860 levels in the South; in Prince George's County values were down less, about 25 to 30 percent (McCauley, 1977: pp. 228-229; 1870d Census: pp. 172-73, 354, 526-528, 672-74).

Prince George's began to establish a more balanced farm economy after the Civil War years, more along the lines called for by the antebellum agricultural reformers. The

key to this development was the economic advantage of proximity to important urban centers, notably Baltimore and Washington. More specifically, the combination of available credit and expanding, accessible urban markets produced a potent formula which county farmers could utilize to their economic advantage. Unlike the Lower South, Prince George's County farmers were more able to avoid the debt traps and single-crop dependency so common in the Lower South. The mortgage, rather than the crop-lien with its control over crop selection, was the financial arrangement which ruled Maryland farming. Maryland had 14 savings banks with over $24 million in deposits; the entire Lower South had only five savings banks and less than $1.5 million in deposits. Over two-thirds (67.3 percent) of Prince George's County farms held mortgages by 1890, compared to 51.8 percent in Maryland and 22.8 percent in the South (McCauley, 1977, pp. 231-233).

The lesser dependence on crop-liens gave county farmers greater flexibility in market opportunities than in the South generally. In almost all areas of production, the county recovered much more rapidly than the South. Significantly, this was not the case in the production of the County's traditional staple: tobacco. Table 17 shows agricultural production levels for Prince George's County from 1850 to 1880, and Table 18 offers average production levels per farmer for the same period. While not evident in

the tables themselves, food production in the county after the Civil War was more than adequate to feed the appropriate population. McCauley determined that the county produced a lesser food surplus in 1880 than in 1860, but the surplus was still substantial. More importantly, this contrasted sharply with the notorious food-importing characteristics of most staple-crop dependent areas of the Lower South at this time.

Corn, wheat, and butter lost ground, but potatoes (Irish and sweet), milk, market gardens, and orchard produce expanded dramatically. The effect was to create greater balance in production. Potatoes, dairying, and truck farming in the county took advantage of both the Baltimore and Washington markets, although Washington provided the closest urban market. All points within the county were also within 20 miles of the District of Columbia line; southernmost points in the county were 60 miles from Baltimore. Transportation improvements after the war greatly increased access to the railroads. By 1880 over three-quarters of the county was within ten miles of the Baltimore and Washington Branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad, or the Pope's Creek Branch of the Baltimore and Potomac. Market gardening, dairying, and orchard production tended to cluster in the election districts around the capitol. Oxon Hill

Manor's Spaldings District (#6) and, after 1874, Oxon Hill District (#12), led the way in emphasizing market gardening and orchard produce after the war. For a map of the election district after 1860, see Figure 12. In 1870, District 2 (Bladensburg), joined Spaldings, and in 1880, Districts 1 (Vansville), 13 (Kend) and 9 (Surrats), were important producers as well. The Spaldings and Oxon Hill districts showed the highest value of market gardens and orchard produce per acre during this period (McCauley, 1977: ~~pp.~~ 238-240).

Milk production and dairying in general were also focused on the districts around Washington. By 1880, Oxon Hill was a relatively unimportant dairying district compared to Districts 6, 13, 2, and 1. Dairying and truck farming altered grain production in Prince George's County, shifting its concentration from the Washington boundary area toward the Patuxent side of the county. Livestock followed a similar pattern, gravitating eastward and southward. The value and quantity of livestock tended to fall throughout the county (McCauley, 1977: ~~pp.~~ 240-243).

Long the dominant staple of the county, tobacco production dropped drastically after 1860 from 13,446,550 to 3,665,054 pounds. Although it recovered to 6,575,246 pounds in 1880, it fell again, to 3,209,896 pounds in 1890. Within these swings was a general reduction in the importance of

tobacco to the county economy. While Prince George's had produced 48.9 percent of Maryland's tobacco in 1840, by 1890 it harvested only 26.0 percent (Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce and Manufacturers, Maryland, 1840; 1850a Census, pp. 225-228; 1860a Census, pp. 72-73, 209, 231; 1870d Census, pp. 172-173, 354; 1880a Census, p. 119; 1890b Census, p. 436). By 1880, tobacco was no longer important in the election districts closest to Washington. While the crop had always been dominant in the Patuxent side of the county, post-Civl War developments reinforced that pattern, although at a lower level of total production. Better soils, access to the key Baltimore market, and good railroad transportation gave the Patuxent a distinct advantage. Patuxent area land, however, lost value after 1860, while land values in the truck farming and dairying districts remained stable or rose. Clearly, the long-standing economic domination of the Patuxent area over the Potomac area was being eroded by the trend toward greater diversification and urbanization in or around Prince George's County (McCauley, 1977, pp. 239-244).

Before evaluating agricultural trends in Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts, demographic trends should be examined briefly. As noted earlier, the population of Prince George's County stagnated through most of the antebellum period. In 1850 the total population of the county was

21,549, 205 fewer than in 1790. An increase in the 1850s was interrupted by the Civil War, but only because of enormous losses of black, rather than white, residents. Table 19 indicates that the county lost 3,897 black residents in the 1860s, even while it was gaining 1,708 whites. With a loss of 28.5 percent of its black population, one need not wonder at the drastic drop in tobacco production during the decade. After 1860, blacks made up less than half of the county total, compared to about 60 percent before the Civil War. Between 1870 and 1890 the county gained 4,942 residents, an increase of 23.4 percent over the two decades.

b. Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts

The numerous tables to be presented in this section are designed to portray an accurate and in-depth image of basic social and economic trends in the latter nineteenth century. The two districts are included because Oxon Hill Manor was located in Spaldings in the 1850 through 1870 census, and in Oxon Hill in the 1880 census (see Figure 12).

In addition, the tables include both Spaldings and Oxon Hill in 1880, and sometimes combine them, because in 1874 Spaldings (#6) was divided into Spaldings (#6) and Oxon Hill (#12) Districts. Unfortunately, combining both Spaldings

and Oxon Hill in 1880 does not geographically recreate the Spaldings of 1870 perfectly. The new Oxon Hill District included a small section of Piscataway (#5) in its geographical boundaries. Figures which combine Spaldings and Oxon Hill totals in 1880 for comparison with 1870 can be considered as slight overestimates.

Table 20 shows agricultural production levels in Spaldings and Oxon Hill from 1850 to 1880. The most notable increases are in the number of farms, in the values of farm implements, orchard produce, and market gardens, and in the quantities of corn, potatoes (especially sweet potatoes), butter, and milk. Significant declines occurred in wheat, rye, and oats. Clear trends are not discernible in all categories; tobacco increased over the low 1870 figure, but was significantly lower than 1860. The two districts follow county-wide trends toward increased truck farming and dairying near the capitol, with grain and tobacco shifting toward the Patuxent. Livestock value, however, appears quite stable. Comparisons between Oxon Hill and Spaldings in 1880 reveal the higher average value of Spaldings 128 farms (£3,673) over Oxon Hill's 138 farms ($2,294) and the greater importance of market gardening in Oxon Hill relative to orchard produce (the reverse is true for Spaldings). Oxon Hill shows higher values in fences and fertilizer and higher quantities of wheat, corn, tobacco, hay, Irish

potatoes, and especially sweet potatoes.

Table 21 shows the same figures as percentages of Prince George's County total production. The percentage of farms increased substantially, as did farm values, farm implements, livestock, orchard produce, market gardens, Irish and sweet potatoes, butter, and milk. Perhaps most revealing from percentage figures is the relative importance of orchard products, market gardens, butter, hay, milk, Irish potatoes, and especially sweet potatoes. Sweet potatoes and market gardening clearly dominate Oxon Hill agriculture, although orchard products, Irish potatoes, and hay show percentages higher than Oxon Hill's 8.2 percent of county farms. The value of all county farms, 4.6 percent, is disproportionately low.

Table 22 shows the number and percentage of all farmers in Spaldings and Oxon Hill who actually produced in the various agricultural categories between 1850 and 1880. Most farmers owned some livestock, although over one-fifth of Spaldings farmers (20.9 percent) in 1860, listed no livestock. Orchard production involved more and more farmers over the period, especially in Spaldings by 1880. Market gardening was taken up by an even higher percentage of farmers, reaching over three-quarters (78.3 percent) of farmers in Oxon Hill by 1880. The decline of the proportion paying wages between 1870 and 1880 may signify an increase

in the number of small, more subsistence or family operated farms. The higher values for fences and fertilizer in Oxon Hill in 1880, compared to Spaldings, suggests fencing animals out of the truck gardens to which farmers were adding more fertilizer. Still, relatively few farmers listed fencing or fertilizer values. Most farmers grew some corn-- over three-quarters in Oxon Hill. Few grew other grains, although one in four Oxon Hill farmers grew wheat. By 1880, tobacco was grown by only one in ten Oxon Hill farmers. Irish potatoes were grown by almost half of Oxon Hill farmers (42.8) and about the same number grew sweet potatoes. By 1880, however, sweet potatoes had increased their importance in both Oxon Hill and Spaldings at a much faster rate than the Irish variety. Except for 1860, about half of all farmers produced butter during these decades. Hay became a less common crop among farmers, with about two in five listing themselves as producers in 1880. No milk was produced in Oxon Hill District in 1880; only five farmers (3.9 percent) showed milk among their products in Spaldings in 1880.

Table 23 reduces gross production figures to averages per farmer (including tenant farmers) from 1850 to 1880. As the number of farms increased, their average value decreased. Oxon Hill farms were considerably less valuable than Spaldings farms, and both had declined dramatically

after 1870. Similar trends occurred between 1870 and 1880 in the values of farm implements, livestock, wages, forest products and all farm products, and in the quantities of wheat, rye, corn, oats, tobacco, Irish potatoes, butter, and hay. Only sweet potatoes and milk showed increases between 1870 and 1880. Comparisons between 1850, 1860, and 1880 suggest that 1870 was not representative of Spaldings true production levels. It is difficult to account for the increase in improved acres, the near doubling of average farm values and livestock, and huge increases in farm implements and animals slaughtered. The number of farms, 88, seems too low, given the fact that the number of farms in the state (Table 16) actually increased between 1860 and 1870. The issue is too complex to be resolved here, but comparisons between 1860 and 1880 indicate more numerous and smaller farms of less average value, more farm implements, less livestock, greater orchard and market garden production, less grain and tobacco, more potatoes, butter, and milk, and less hay. Both districts followed this pattern, with Oxon Hill farmers emphasizing market gardens over orchards and producing more wheat, corn, tobacco, and especially sweet potatoes than the average Spaldings farmer. Milk was an exception to the pattern since Oxon Hill farmers listed no milk in 1880.

Table 24 shows average and median production levels per

farmer in Oxon Hill and Spaldings from 1850 to 1880. Juxtaposing the two measures demonstrates the degree to which farmers may have specialized in the production of certain items. In 1880, for example, the widest variations in production levels per farmer in Oxon Hill District were in farm implements, orchard products, fences, hay, and sweet potatoes. The most dramatic differential between average and median values was in Spaldings orchard production in 1880 where half of all producers earned $25 or less, yet the average per producing farmer was $143, over five times greater. In general the differentials between average and median production levels were substantial in most categories, indicating considerable specialization and inequality. Over half of Oxon Hill's 1880 farmers worked 30 acres or less, owned $50 or less in implements, and $150 or less in livestock. Half of all farms were valued at $1,500 or less.

Without additional research it is difficult to determine the general economic vitality of Prince George's agricultural economy after the Civil War. McCauley found that insofar as certain areas diversified, they tended to grow economically; the truck farming and dairying areas of the county appeared to be most successful in terms of land values. Table 25 looks at production levels in the county and in Oxon Hill and Spaldings Districts by comparing

percentages of total production to percentage of population within their larger geographical units. The table also shows Prince George's rank for each category among Maryland's 20 counties. Although ranked tenth in population (2.8 percent), the county was ranked first in tobacco and sweet potato production and second in market gardening. It was also ahead of its population ranking in total acres in farms, improved acres, farm value, forest products, fences, rye, and milk. Oxon Hill, which contained 4.9 percent of the county's population, showed values higher than that proportion in farm implements, livestock, orchard products, market gardens, fertilizer, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes, butter, and hay. Particularly high were market gardens (26.8 percent) and sweet potatoes (44.9 percent). The value of Oxon Hill farms, however, fell below the population proportion, as did improved acres. If the economic picture was brightening, it was probably doing so mostly for the market gardeners and orchard producers.

The average size of farms declined rapidly after 1850, and the number of farms increased. Most new farms in the South after the Civil War were created out of the old plantations as they were forced into various tenant and sharecropping arrangements. Table 26 shows the decline in average total and improved acreage per farm in Maryland, Prince George's County, Spaldings District and Oxon Hill

District from 1850 to 1880. It also shows the variations between these geographical units. Since average Spaldings and Oxon Hill farms were consistently smaller than average county farms, to maintain economic equality with larger farms would have required more intensive exploitation. The growth of market gardening was both a cause and a reflection of the trend toward smaller farms closer to the Washington boundary.

Landholding and production characteristics among tenants in Maryland has received virtually no attention among researchers, despite the fact that in 1880-- the first separate census recording of tenants -- 30.9 percent of Maryland's farmers were tenants. Both Oxon Hill and Spaldings District farmers included substantial percentages of tenants, 29.7 percent in the former and 24.2 percent in the latter. Most tenants in Maryland, in the South, and in the nation generally in 1880 were sharecroppers rather than cash tenants; that is, farmers who paid rent as a percentage of the crop rather than in money. Sharecroppers usually received tools, seed, or money loans from the landowner or a local merchant, and it was this procedure which gave landowners and merchants effective control over the sharecroppers' agricultural choices. Maryland followed Southern and national patterns in the distribution of sharecroppers and tenants. Over two-thirds of tenants, 69.1

percent, were croppers-- 21.4 percent of all farmers. The remaining 30.9 percent of tenants were cash tenants -- 9.6 percent of all Maryland farmers (1880a Census, pp. 28-29, 60-61, 119).

Table 27 summarizes the distribution of owners and tenants in Maryland, Prince George's County, Oxon Hill District and Spaldings District in 1880. Immediately noticeable is the divergence of the county and, to an even greater extent, of the two districts, from Maryland and national patterns. In Prince George's, for example, only 56.6 percent of all tenants were sharecroppers, as opposed to 69.1 percent in Maryland. Also, almost half of all tenants were cash-based, versus less than one-third (30.9 percent) for the state. Even more striking, however, was the complete reversal of the distribution of cash tenants and sharecroppers in the two districts. The overwhelming majority of tenants, 87.8 percent in Oxon Hill and 93.5 percent in Spaldings, were cash tenants. Sharecroppers were a distinct minority. Researchers have not addressed this anomaly but the explanation may lie in McCauley's emphasis on the greater availability of institutional credit in Maryland than in the South generally. It seems very probable that the proximity of urban resources and markets to some districts in the county was influential in facilitating this divergent pattern. Only further research

will clarify the issue. Among the known and possible tenants at Oxon Hill Manor in the 1870s (to be discussed later), all paid their rents in cash.

Table 27 also offers data on the distribution of total and improved acreage among owners, cash tenants, and sharecroppers. The most striking statistic is the fact that the average total and the average improved acres held by tenants in both Oxon Hill and Spaldings was nearly equal to those held by owners. When the cash rental tenants are separated, their totals are even closer to owners in Oxon Hill and actually exceed the averages for Spaldings owners. Again, this points to greater financial resources available to tenants in the county than in other parts of Maryland and the South. The position of the sharecroppers was significantly inferior to that of the cash tenants and owners. While a ~~minority~~ majority??, they held much less total acreage and considerable less improved acreage than the owners and cash tenants.

Table 28 shows average agricultural production levels by all farmers in Maryland and Prince Georges' County and by both farmers and tenants in Oxon Hill District in 1880. County farmers held considerably more total and improved acreage than state farmers generally, although average farm values were only slightly higher. District differences were evident in the higher production levels of market gardens,

tobacco, and sweet potatoes, and in the lower levels of fertilizer, wheat, oats, butter, and hay. Oxon Hill farmers held significantly less total and improved acreage than county farmers, and farm values were only 56.6 percent of the county average. District farmers showed distinctly higher than county average levels only in market gardening and sweet potatoes. Lower levels were significant in livestock, forest products, all farm products, fences, wheat, rye, corn, oats, tobacco, and milk. There is a clear impression of a good deal of reliance on market gardening among Oxon Hill farmers.

Among Oxon Hill tenants, values tended to be lower than farmer averages in most, but not all, categories. Although tenants held almost as much total and improved acreage as farmers generally, the average of their farms was only 81.4 percent of district averages. Their farms were only worth 46.1 percent of county farms generally. District farmers showed values which were only 56.8 percent of county averages. Neither Oxon Hill District farmers nor tenants, then, represented the top county farmers, at least on an average basis. Although the tenants produced less than the farmers in most categories, they outproduced farmers in several: market gardens, corn, oats, and sweet potatoes. Overall, the figures suggest that tenants occupied lands of lesser quality than farmers and were geared more intensively

to the urban market.

Tables 29 and 30 show average agricultural production by farmers and tenants in Oxon Hill and Spaldings Districts, respectively, in 1880, but each table also indicates the differences in average production between all farmers and tenants and actual producers of the various items. While the general production for owner and tenants at Oxon Hill holds true when examining actual producers, producing tenants actually outpaced producing farmers in tobacco as well as market gardens, corn, oats, and sweet potatoes. Spaldings District tenant producers showed higher values than producing farmers in farm implements, wages, all farm products, fertilizer, Irish and sweet potatoes, hay, and especially market gardens and milk. The Spaldings tenants, in fact, produced all of the district's milk.

A final table on owner and tenant agricultural production in Oxon Hill and Spaldings Districts in 1880, Table 31, separates farm owners from all farmers (which includes tenants) for purposes of comparing farm owners and farm tenants more accurately. The patterns do not change drastically, but some differentials expanded. Average total and improved acreage held by owners was slightly higher than averages which included tenants in their calculations. Farm values, however, were much higher, rising from $2,294 to $2,474. Average tenant farms, then, were only 75.5 percent

of the value of average owner farms, a better indication of tenant economic status than 81.4 percent of all farmers. In most categories the differential between farm owners and tenants leaned in favor of the owners when compared to the differential between all farmers and tenants. In market gardening, rye, corn, oats, tobacco, Irish and sweet potatoes, and hay, however, the differential widened in favor of the tenants. As indicated earlier, this suggests that average tenants were more market-oriented than average farmers. In Spaldings the same pattern is evident, although the change in the differential was less, generally, than in Oxon Hill. In average farm values, for example, Spalding tenants fell from 89.5 percent of all farmers to 86.7 percent. The lesser differential in Spaldings indicates that the tenants in the district tended to be more economically equal to farm owners than in Oxon Hill.

The higher values in Spaldings District when compared to Oxon Hill may reflect the different racial characteristics of the two regions. Fully 100 percent of Spaldings tenants were white, compared to only 73.0 percent in Oxon Hill. Among Oxon Hill's 27.0 percent blacks, 16.2 percent were listed on the 1880 census as black and 10.8 percent as mulatto. It should be noted that three of the 31 Spaldings tenants and four of the 41 Oxon Hill tenants listed on the agricultural census could not be found on the

population census, perhaps because they did not reside on the land being farmed. The percentage of black and mulatto tenants, 27.0, was an under-representation of the Oxon Hill population, where 34.4 percent was black and 6.3 percent mulatto (1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural and Population Censuses).

Table 32 demonstrates the manner in which blacks were under-represented among Oxon Hill farmers (which includes tenants) and over-represented among farm laborers. Mulattoes were slightly over-represented among farmers. In Spaldings, where none of the tenants were black, under-representation among farmers was even greater than in Oxon Hill, with farm laborer representation about the same. Mulattoes were under-represented among farmers and, like blacks, over-represented among farm laborers. Table 33 summarizes the patterns.

3. Summary

The dominant trend in Maryland agriculture after the Civil War was toward greater diversification. Our knowledge of state-wide trends is incomplete, but the pattern in Prince George's County was unmistakable. Research here has pointed to the variations within the county, as areas more accessible to urban markets shifted even more rapidly from

traditional reliance on the tobacco staple toward market gardening, orchard production, and dairying. In Prince George's Oxon Hill District, dairying was less important than in other districts close to the District of Columbia. Livestock and grain tended to shift away from the D. C. area toward the Patuxent River regions.

As in the South generally, the number of farms rose rapidly. Tenants may have farmed a much higher percentage of all farms than before the Civil War, although the lack of data for the period before 1880 makes such statements impossible to verify. Clearly, more black tenants appeared after 1860. The impact of Maryland's large free black population on tenant patterns and on agriculture generally is unclear. Nor do we know the degree to which white tenancy prevailed before 1880. The total white dominance of tenancy in Spaldings District in 1880, moreover, suggests a somewhat different agricultural pattern in that district when compared to Oxon Hill, where 27.0 percent of tenants were black or mulatto in 1880.

Prince George's County endured declining land values after the Civil War, but not all regions of the county saw this decline. McCauley calculates that the districts closest to the D. C. boundary experienced gains, owing to the advantage of accessible markets for truck, orchard, and dairy products. Despite proximity to D. C., however, Oxon

Hill District farmers did not appear to prosper in relation to some of the other districts. Still, both Oxon Hill and the county were growing in absolute terms, albeit at an uneven rate within the various categories of production. Despite the Civil War, the agricultural economy was in much better condition than in 1840.

Oxon Hill Manor Since the American Revolution

Finally!!

1. Introduction

This section of the report examines specific developments at the Oxon Hill Manor site since the American Revolution and, wherever possible, attempts to relate changes to regional and statewide trends. It is divided into four distinct chronological periods. The Walter Dulany Addison period witnessed the decline of the estate and its eventual sale to the Berry family in 1810. The Thomas Berry period coincides roughly with the antebellum years between 1810 and 1860. The 1850 census provides the first comprehensive data on Oxon Hill Manor as an agricultural estate, while tax assessment and other records round out Berry's overall social and economic position. The section on Thomas E. Berry, 1860 to 1888, begins with Berry's possible occupancy of the estate before the Civil War and

examines his relationship to the manor until its sale in 1888. Although Berry died in 1879, the estate was held in trusteeship until its sale in 1888. The last sub-section deals with the break-up of the estate into smaller farm units, a process which had began in the late 1870s. Because the manor house burned in 1895 and because the property lost its integrity as a "plantation" unit, the latter period receives only minimal attention and closes with a brief discussion of Sumner Welles's new Oxon Hill Manor, located on a section of the old Oxon Hill Manor property.

2. The Walter Dulany Addison Years, 1793-1810

Despite litigation carried on in his name in the 1770s and 1780s, Walter Dulany Addison apparently had little involvement with Oxon Hill Manor until he and his new wife, Elizabeth Dulany Hesselius, moved from Harmony Hall in 1793 (Murray, 1895, p. 136). His presence in the 1790 census as the unmarried owner of 20 slaves indicates that he had returned to Maryland from England, where he had been attending school (1790 Census, p. 92). From the outset, Addison seemed disinterested in managing the estate, at least along the lines of his father. Murray points out that Addison was an especially pious individual who was impatient of the social activities and obligations of his rank. He

refused to attend the theater or balls, and found the expense of Oxon Hill an increasingly annoying burden. The house, Murray explains, "was generally full of guests" (Murray, 1895, p. 136).

Addison also began to rid himself of some of his property. Sometime soon after he moved into Oxon Hill in 1793, perhaps in 1794 or even later, he gave approximately 400 acres of Oxon Hill (part of his 618-acre Hart Park tract -- see Figure 5) to his mother. Murray claims that his mother's estate "had become seriously embarrassed...owing to the mismanagement of his step-father," Thomas Hanson (Murray, 1895, pp. 89-90). She and her husband sold the tract in 1797 to Nathaniel Washington (MHR, Land Record, JRM 6, p. 80, October 3, 1797), but Washington sold the property back to Walter Addison in 1803 (MHR, Land Records, JRM 10, p. 16, and p. 145, Jan. 18, 1803 and March 12, 1803).

In 1797 Walter Addison also sold two other parts of Oxon Hill Manor. He sold 500 acres of the Locust Thicket and Discontent tracts (see Figure 5) to his brother, Henry Addison, and a total of 269.75 acres (parts of Oxon Hill Manor and Force) to Nicholas Lingan. Murray states that Walter "gave" the 500 acres to Henry because his younger brother had not been provided for in his father's will. Her statement is true in spirit, since Walter made the transaction out of "love and affection"; but he did ask a

relatively nominal 300 pounds for the land (MHR, Land Records, JRM 6/p. 173, Oct. 6, 1797; Murray, 1895, p. 90). The part of the acreage sold to Nicholas Lingan and taken from Oxon Hill Manor was not specified, but it can be approximated by noting that Force had only a total of 54 acres. Addison must have sold at least 215 3/4 acres (269 3/4 minus 54 acres) of the Oxon Hill Manor acreage although the actual acreage was larger because he sold only part of Force (MHR, Land Records, JRM 6/: p. 86, Oct. 27, 1797).

By 1797, Addison had sold or given away almost 1,300 of the non-dower lands of Oxon Hill Manor. Sometime before 1782 his uncle, John Addison, had received 100 3/4 acres, thereby reducing Walter's holdings to 3,562 1/4 of the original 3,663 acres. Not counting his mother's dower, Walter owned 2,734 3/4 acres. In 1790 he sold 65 7/8 acres to Peter Savary for 308 pounds. This tract came from the original Locust Thicket grant to the south of the manor house. Savary had already purchased the "Lodge", a house and lands owned originally by John Addison and purchased by the Reverend Jonathan Boucher. As a Loyalist, Boucher had had his property confiscated during the Revolution. Dr. William Baker purchased the estate then sold it to Savary (MHR, Land Records, JRM 4/: p. 84, Nov. 2, 1795; JRM 6/: p. 173, Oct. 6, 1797).

Subtracting the nearly 1,200 acres which Addison had

sold to Savary (65 98/100), his brother Henry (500), and Nicholas Lingan (approximately 215 75/100) or had given to his mother (400) from his original 2,734 75/100 non-dower lands, Addison was left with about 1,500 acres (1,552 38/100) in 1797. He was in control of the dower, however, as indicated by his making various leasing arrangements (to be discussed later) and by his occupying the manor house. The documents offer no indication of any formal arrangement with his mother or step-father, and he did not obtain legal control of the dower until he purchased it in 1807.

While the foregoing deed research indicates that Addison was not averse to dismantling his father's estate, it does not accurately represent his actual landholdings. The 1798 Federal Tax Assessment listed the manor as 2,522 acres. Since the assessment included the manor house, and thus the 828-acre dower lands, it can be presumed that Addison had sold or given away only 1,040 25/100 acres of his 3,562 25/100 acres (3,663 minus 100 75/100 given his uncle, John Addison). The approximately 1,300 acres derived from the deeds is evidently incorrect (MHS, Ms. 1999, 1798 Federal Tax Assessment, Prince George's County).

The tax assessment of 1800 showed Walter Dulany Addison as the owner of 2,625 5/10 acres at Oxon Hill Manor, separated into 1,805 5/10 acres valued at 18 shillings and five pence per acre and 820 acres, clearly the dower, valued

at 36 shillings and 10 pence per acre (MHR, Tax Assessments, Prince George's County, 1800; hereafter cited as MHR, Assessments). Since no deed transactions had occurred by 1800, ~~I have~~ there is no explanation for the increase over the 1798 figure. In 1803 Addison recovered the 400-acre Hart Park tract originally given to his mother and later sold to Nathaniel Washington. In 1805 he sold 15 acres of Oxon Hill Manor to Francis Edward Hall Rozer (MHR, Land Records, JRM 11/~~p.~~: 238, Dec. 5, 1805). In the 1806 tax assessment he is listed as owning 2,812 25/~~1/4~~ acres, 1942 25/~~1/4~~ acres plus the 820-acre dower (MHR, Assessments/ 1806).

By 1806, Addison was no longer living at the Oxon Hill Manor house. When he re-acquired the Hart Park tract in 1803 he also decided to move to the residence there. Murray explains his action as based on three factors: first, his dislike for the humid climate at Oxon Hill because of its proximity to the Potomac; second, his discomfort with the expense and social whirl around the house; and, third, his desire to open a school at the Hart Park location. The Hart Park residence was being altered, Murray explains, to make it similar in size to Oxon Hill. Addison opened the school in 1804 (Murray, 1895, ~~pp.~~ 119-120).

In 1807 Addison purchased the dower from his mother, Rebecca Hanson, and his stepfather, Thomas Hawkins Hanson, for £2,200. The dower was listed as approximately 820

acres, the same as in the tax assessments (MHR, Land Records, JRM 12/1 p. 205, March 12, 1807). In 1808 the 500 acres sold to his brother, Henry, in 1797 was sold by Henry's estate to Captain William Marbury for £2,500. Henry had died recently and his property was being sold to cover debts (MHR, Land Records, JRM 12, p. 462, Jan. 25, 1808). The 1809 tax assessment showed Walter Dulany Addison as owning 2,802 25/100 acres--1,982 acres plus the 820-acre dower. This was only 10 acres less than the 1806 assessment listing (MHR, Assessments, 1809).

By the close of 1810 Walter Dulany Addison had lost all of the 2,802 25/100 acres except for 786 25/100 acres. The sale of 1,328 acres, including the Oxon Hill Manor house, to Zachariah Berry in 1810 accounted for the bulk of the 1,474 lost, but the deeds do not indicate the manner in which Addison sold the other 146 acres. The 1810 assessment, however, names the tracts of land held by the listed landowners, and from these records we can determine, more or less accurately, the dispersal of the original Oxon Hill Manor as of 1810. Following the sale of the manor house to Zachariah Berry the distribution of the Oxon Hill Manor tracts was:

Walter Dulany Addison	–	786 25/100 acres
Zachariah Berry	–	1,328

John Bayne	–	215
Charles Beall ("colored")	–	75
Dr. Samuel DeButts	–	257.25 ~~1/4~~
Francis Kirby	–	532 (Hart Park)
Daniel Moseley	–	10
Capt. William Marbury	–	500
Samuel Ridout	–	81
Joseph Thomas	–	12.25 ~~1/4~~
Total		3,796.75 ~~3/4~~ acres

reword

At present it is not possible to ~~I cannot~~ account for the 3,796.75 ~~3/4~~-acre figure's being higher than the original 3,663 acres. It is possible that Kirby's 532 acres included part of the "Hart Park" grant which was not in the original Oxon Hill Manor. Also, the 1810 assessment was not necessarily accurate in all details (MHR, Assessments, 1810; MHR, Land Records, JRM 13, ~~pp.~~ 625, 627, March 16 and 17, 1810).

By 1810 Addison was living in Georgetown, although he still owned the 786.25 ~~1/4~~ acres of Oxon Hill Manor. He sold 328 of those acres to Ebsworth Bayne in 1817, thereby reducing his holdings to 458.25 ~~1/4~~ acres (MHR, Land Records, JRM 17, ~~pp.~~ 146, 242, Jan. 1, 1817). Bayne built a home at this location, about one-half mile southeast of the manor house, and named the estate "Mount Salubria". It became the residence of his son, Dr. John Bayne, in 1841 when Bayne

moved into the home with his new wife, Harriet Addison, the niece of Walter Dulany Addison (Clapp, et al. ~~Billet and Randall~~, 1938, p. 6).

Between 1818 and 1820 Walter Dulany Addison sold his remaining 458.25 ~~.74~~ acres of the original Oxon Hill Manor. The 1822 tax assessment lists nine and possibly omits a tenth individual who collectively owned approximately 2,113 acres of Oxon Hill. Adding Zachariah Berry's 1,328 acres brings the total to 3,441 acres. I cannot account for the missing 222 acres. It is sufficient, however, to note that the Addison family, some of whom still lived near the Oxon Hill Manor estate, had given up one of Maryland's largest slave plantations in the 30 years between 1793, when Walter Dulany Addison took over the estate, and 1820 (MHR, Assessments, 1818-1822).

Although Addison slowly divested himself of his Oxon Hill Manor estate, he remained an exceptionally wealthy individual. Tax assessments and other records provide some indication of his absolute wealth as well as his relative economic standing within the county. In 1790 Addison owned 20 slaves, but we have no comparative data to place that number in perspective. In 1796 he owned only seven slaves, valued at £214 ~~pounds,~~ and an additonal £245 personal property, for a total of £459 personal property. Within Piscataway and Hynson Hundreds, Oxon Hill Manor's

administrative unit, average slave ownership was 8.5 per assessed individual. In the county the average was 6.2. Average total personal wealth in Piscataway and Hynson was 146 pounds, about one-third of Addison's total. The county average was 175 pounds. The wealthiest area of the county in 1796 was the Collington/Western Branch Hundreds unit where Zachariah Berry resided. Average slaveholdings were 10.8 and average total personal wealth 315 pounds (MHR, Assessments, 1796).

Because of his enormous estate, Addison far outstripped average property owners in Prince George's. His 3,550 acres in 1796 was valued at £10,051, almost twenty times the district (Piscataway/Hynson) average of £510 and the county average of £519. The acreage was only about ten times the district 378-acre average and ten times the county 351-acre average, indicating that his land was considerably more valuable than most. Since he was a relatively small slaveholder, Addison was not among the wealthiest county residents in personal wealth. Henry Rozer, his neighbor to the south, owned £3,542 personal property. Hannah West, in King George/Grubb Hundreds, owned £4,259, including 113 slaves. Zachariah Berry owned £1,673 ~~pounds~~ personal property, with 58 slaves. Addison's real estate, however, made him the wealthiest landowner in the county, followed by Thomas Snowden at £8,373. Several individuals owned larger

acreages than Addison, yet none had lands worth as much as the Oxon Hill Manor estate (MHR, Assessments, 1796).

Our best physical picture of the estate after the 1775 inventory comes from the 1798 Federal Tax Assessment. It described the house as two stories, 66 by 36 feet in size, with 45 windows. Near the house was a 21 by 30 foot kitchen and two stables each 21 by 30 feet. All of these structures stood on a 1.5-acre ~~1/2~~ acre plot. The house and the three "outhouses" were valued at $2,000. The estate also included 20 "dwelling houses", presumably slave quarters or tenant houses or both. Valued at less than $100 total, they could not have been very attractive buildings. The estate listed 14 slaves, seven more than in the 1796 tax assessment. Half of the slaves were under 12 years of age (MHS, Ms. 1999, 1798 Federal Tax Assessment, Prince George's County).

In 1800 Addison owned 12 slaves according to the tax assessment, only seven according to the 1800 Census (1800 Census, p. 320; MHR, Assessments, 1800). The county average in 1800 was 13.3 slaves per owner and the median 6.0, so Addison was still among the top half of all slaveowners. Almost half of all county householders, 46.5 percent, owned no slaves, and slave ownership was extremely concentrated. Less than 10 percent, 9.5 percent, of all slaveholders owned 41.2 percent of all slaves; the bottom 48.8 percent held only 11.7 percent. The wide gap between the median and the

average for the county points to the fact that several individuals owned large numbers of slaves. Hannah West owned 155 slaves, John Waring 105. Zachariah Berry owned 88 slaves in 1800, making him the seventh largest slaveowner in the county. Despite these slave numbers, it is sobering to note that Robert Carter of Nomini Hall, Virginia, owned 509 slaves when he began freeing them in 1791 (1800 Census: pp. 198-210, 224).

By 1806 Addison had lost some of his real estate, but continued to rank first in the county because of the high value of Oxon Hill Manor. He had also increased the value of his personal property to £780, although he owned only 10 slaves. While many other planters ranked well above him in personal property and slaves, he was still well above the county averages of £243 personal property and 6.5 slaves (MHR, Assessments, 1806). By 1810, the year he sold the Oxon Hill Manor house, Addison was no longer listed in the tax assessments or the census. In 1809, however, his 2,802 ~~174~~ 24 acres at Oxon Hill continued to rank him first in real estate value. Personal property calculations suggest some deterioration of the county economy, perhaps reflective of the general malaise in agriculture. Average personal property had declined from £243 in 1806 to £201 in 1809, although Addison's personal property had risen from £780 to £800 pounds. The number of slaves in Piscataway/Hynson

Hundreds had fallen from 1,566 to 1,488, but the average per owner had increased from 4.2 to 4.5 slaves. On the verge of selling his valuable Oxon Hill Manor property, Walter Dulany Addison remained one of the wealthiest men in the county in 1809 (MHR, Assessments, 1806, 1809).

The relatively small number of slaves at Oxon Hill Manor during Walter Dulany Addison's tenure supports the notion that he was less active and less interested as a manager of his plantation than his father. While the documentation is not conclusive, it appears that he may have relied more on tenant arrangements than on direct slave management to produce an income from the estate. Previous commentary has indicated that Walter's father and perhaps the earlier manor owners commonly leased lands to tenants. Murray reports the presence of "many tenants" at Oxon Hill in the 1790s, one of whom, Joseph Thomas, was the operator of the Oxon Hill Ferry, called "Thomas' Ferry." Figure 5 refers to the "Berry Land," and Figure 13 shows the location of the ferry in 1798 (map from Friis, 1968a). A 1797 deed also refers to the site as "Thomas' Ferry," although deeds from 1801 and 1806 use simply "The Ferry" to describe the leased area. Thomas appears to have rented the ferry site plus 20 adjoining acres, although he also leased land and possibly operated a second ferry at the south end of the "ashen swamp" which appears on the map in Figure 5. The

earlier lease of Oxon Hill Manor to Leonard Marbury refers to a landing at this point at the mouth of Susquehanna Creek on dower land. No acreages in Thomas' leases were specified in the deeds (MHR, Land Records, JRM 6/: p. 86, Oct. 27, 1797; JRM 8/: p. 520, July 7, 1801; JRM 11/: p. 374, Jan. 4, 1806).

Addison also leased a large section of Oxon Hill Manor -- 800 acres -- to John and Ebsworth Bayne in 1798. Referred to as the "plantation on which John Bayne now lives," which suggests a previous lease, the land was rented for £500 and for the lifetime of the longer-lived of the two lessees. Restrictions included keeping the houses, buildings, fences, and improvements in "tenantable repair" (MHR, Land Records, JRM 6/: p. 351, May 9, 1798; JRM 16/: p. 90, Feb. 1, 1814).

Another Addison lease was to John Davies in 1801. Davies rented "the marsh land of Oxon Hill Manor lying immediately on the [Potomac River] bounded on the one side by the said river and on the other by the fields of [Susquehanna Creek] and Douglass." Douglass was probably another tenant. The Davies's lease had a clear developmental orientation, calling for him to reclaim part of the marsh land by building a bank from the southwest corner of the estate at "Mr. Rozer's fence" to the mouth of Susquehanna Creek by 1805. The lease was to run for 21 years, and it stipulated that Davies was to grow timothy,

ryegrass, and clover only after the lease had run 10 years. The intention of this requirement regarding green manures is unclear, as are the exact boundaries and monetary terms of the agreement. No monetary terms were mentioned, although Davies was to receive title to two acres of land near Mr. Rozer's fence as long as he upheld the terms. The lease also referred to the renting of an unspecified acreage to Francis Kirby near the mouth of Susquehanna Creek and to his road rights to a demised "Wood Landing" in the area. References to several fishing houses and fishing landings did not elaborate (MHR, Land Records, JRM 8/10. 520, July 7, 1801).

No other leases by Walter Dulany Addison appear among the land records or in other sources. Since Murray believed that the estate had "many tenants," it seems probable that Addison made oral arrangements with a number of other individuals. Thomas, Kirby, and John Bayne, also purchased parts of the estate at some unspecified time. In 1808 Captain William Marbury, perhaps a relative of a former manor tenant, Leonard Marbury, bought the 500 acres which Addison had sold to his brother, Henry Addison, in 1797; Ebsworth Bayne bought 328 acres in 1817 when he terminated the 1798 lease. If Walter Addison earned substantial income from his leases, the records do not show it. Evidence suggests the contrary, since his personal property did not

increase very rapidly and since he gradually sold his real property.

In her 1895 book, Murray reported that Addison decided to free his slaves in 1798, as indicated in a 1798 will in her possession in 1895. Women were to be freed at age 20 and men at age 25. She also informs us that his decision was very unpopular and very damaging to the agricultural success of his estate. The best workers were lost, she said, leaving only the "old, helpless, and young slaves" (Murray, 1895, pp. 125-133, 192).

Although Addison owned 20 slaves in 1790, he still owned 14 in 1798 and 10 in 1809. The records indicate that he did free two slaves in 1801, one of whom was rented to Frederick Koones, a tavern keeper at Piscataway (MHR, Land Records, JRM 8, p. 476, April 9, 1801). The decline from 14 to 10 slaves, however, does not indicate that he moved quickly to free his slaves, if at all, although his slaves may not yet have reached the requisite ages by 1809.

Manumission was clearly in the air during these years. In Prince George's County the number of free blacks rose between 1800 and 1810 from only 648 to 4,929 (See Table 15). Still, the general picture which emerges from Addison's years at Oxon Hill Manor is one of disinterest. He did not hold large numbers of slaves relative to his potential. He slowly sold parts of the estate, even while he was arranging

for land reclamation. He left the manor house in 1803 or 1804 to start a school at another residence on the estate, perhaps leaving the manor house vacant. Murray also points out that Addison was not a good manager of his money. He made a number of poor investments, she notes, and would not use the proceeds from the sale of the estate in 1810 wisely. Addison's attitude toward Oxon Hill Manor must have been ambivalent. Although quoted as saying "Rejoice with me, I am relieved of a great burden" when the house was sold in 1810, his wife Elizabeth had been buried at the Oxon Hill cemetery in 1808 and Addison himself asked to be buried at Oxon Hill when he died in 1848 (Murray, 1895: pp. 125-133, 157, 191).

Although the documentation is not adequate to present a complete picture of Oxon Hill Manor during Addison's tenure, certain conclusions seem justified. Direct management of a large slave population was not his approach, unlike previous owners. Numerous tenants lived on the estate, some of whom, like the Baynes, were moderate slave owners. In 1798 John Bayne owned 15 slaves, Ebsworth Bayne seven (MHR, MS. 1999, 1798 Federal Tax Assessment, Prince George's County). Addison displayed some interest in improving the estate, indicated by his "developmental" lease to John Davies in 1801. Yet he slowly sold the lands and chose not to live at the manor house after 1803. Addison's financial

difficulties may have reflected the general agricultural problems of the period. The decline in tobacco's success, owing in part to soil exhaustion, may have damaged local agriculture. The number of slaves declined in the Piscataway/Hynson Hundreds from 2,961 in 1796 to 1,566, a 47.1 percent decline which was far greater than the 11.6 percent for the county (MHR, Assessments, 1796, 1806). It is possible that the manor and its immediate region suffered even more than other parts of the county, but without agricultural production data or private papers that is impossible to determine. Whatever his motivations or difficulties, Walter Dulany Addison had sold most of the original 3,663 acre estate by 1810 and would sell the remainder by 1820.

3. The Thomas and Zacharia Berry Years, 1810-1860.

Evaluation of the Oxon Hill Manor site during the nineteenth century antebellum years is complicated by the fact that the owner of the estate until 1845, Zachariah Berry (1749-1845), did not reside at the manor; rather, his youngest son, Thomas Berry (1781-1854), lived at Oxon Hill from 1812 until his death in 1854. Thomas inherited the property from Zachariah on his father's death in 1845. He apparently bequeathed it to his son, Thomas E. Berry

(1815-1879), although the details on transmission are uncertain since he died intestate (See Figure 14). To examine ownership patterns, then, involves some awareness of the difference between ownership and occupancy. While we can determine a good deal about the social and economic status of Zachariah and Thomas Berry in this period, we know relatively little about land use and labor patterns. The analysis must rest heavily on data on slave owners at the estate and on Berry's agricultural production in 1850.

When Zachariah Berry purchased Oxon Hill Manor in 1810, he was already a well-to-do planter in the Western Branch /Collington Hundred Unit, Prince George's County, where he owned 2,295 acres of land valued at £5,181. This amount of real property made him the second wealthiest landowner in the Collington/Western Branch Hundreds, where average real property was £993. Berry also owned land (242 acres) in New Scotland/Oxon/Bladensburg Hundreds (not separated) in 1810. His personal property at his home plantation in Western Branch Hundred, called "Concord and Outlet Enlarged," included 57 slaves (£1,375) and other property (livestock, securities, plate, gold and silver watches, household furniture) valued altogether at £2,519. This total made him the wealthiest householder, in terms of personal property, in Collington/Western Branch Hundreds. The £2,519 was over six times the £391 average for the two Hundreds, and his 57

slaves were about five times the 11.6 average. Taken together, his real and personal property made him the second wealthiest individual in Collington/Western Branch Hundreds (MHR, Assessments, 1810).

The 1811 tax assessment separated Berry's 1,328 acres at Oxon Hill Manor into two units, 449 acres valued at 46 shillings per acre and 879 acres valued at 96 shillings per acre, for a total value of £4,076. The larger units undoubtedly included the manor house, and Berry apparently had added 59 ~~quality~~ acres to the 820-acre former dower land. Only Edward Henry Calvert owned property valued higher than Oxon Hill Manor in 1811. The average real property value per assessed owner in Piscataway/Hynson Hundreds in 1811 was £454, less than 10 percent of Oxon Hill Manor's value. Berry listed no personal property at Oxon Hill in 1811, suggesting that the house may have been vacant (MHR, Assessments, 1811). Most of the individuals who had purchased parts of Oxon Hill Manor by 1811 were small or moderate slave owners. John Bayne owned five slaves and £258 of personal property and Joseph Thomas held eight slaves and £456 of personal property. Dr. Samuel DeButts had 13 slaves and £656 property, Francis Kirby owned 15 slaves and £768 property, William Marbury 23 slaves and £670 property, and Samuel Ridout 11 slaves and £456 ~~pounds~~ of property. Charles Beall, a black or mulatto, owned no

slaves and £149 ~~pounds~~ property. Average slave holding in the district in 1809, two years earlier, had been 4.5 slaves and £201 personal property, indicating that most of the purchasers were economically better off than the average householder (MHR, Assessments, 1809, 1811).

In 1812 Thomas Berry, Zachariah's 31-year old son, took up residence at Oxon Hill Manor. Although Zachariah continued to be listed as the owner, Thomas had brought nine slaves and £519 total personal property to Oxon Hill. Thomas does not appear in Prince George's County census or tax assessments before 1812, so it is probable that he had been residing outside the county (MHR, Assessments, 1812). By 1815 Berry owned 12 slaves and personal property worth $1,597. In the same year, Berry married Mary Williams, daughter of a wealthy planter, Thomas O. Williams. When her father died in 1819, she and Thomas Berry inherited four separate properties totaling 776.75 ~~3/4~~ acres in New Scotland/Oxon/Bladensburg Hundreds (north of Piscataway/Hynson Hundreds in Prince George's County). They probably inherited the property in 1820, the same year Berry's personal property mushroomed to 43 slaves and $4,161. The real property assessment for 1820 has been lost, but the 776.75 ~~3/4~~ acres appear in the 1821 real property assessment. By 1828 Berry had reduced the four properties to one 650-acre estate called "Seat Pleasant," presumably

the former site of Thomas O. Williams's home plantation (MHR, Assessments, 1815-1828; Land Records, JBB 5, p. 102, Nov. 10, 1847).

In 1825 the tax assessments began to list Oxon Hill Manor under Thomas Berry, rather than under Zachariah. Since Zachariah bequeathed Oxon Hill to Thomas in his will in 1845, we know that Thomas had not become the owner in 1825 (Prince George's County Courthouse (PGCC), Wills, P.C. 1, 1845: pp. 284-289). By 1825, moreover, Zachariah had accumulated 1,665 additional acres in Piscataway/Hynson Hundreds, had expanded his holdings in Collington/Western Branch Hundreds, and had added over 1,400 acres in Mattapony/Washington/Prince Frederick Hundreds. Another change in 1825 was Thomas Berry's listing of slaves and other personal property at both Oxon Hill and Seat Pleasant, the latter being his property in New Scotland/Oxon/Bladensburg Hundreds. His 49 slaves were divided between the two areas, 21 at Oxon Hill and 28 at Seat Pleasant. The fact that he listed "plate" only at Oxon Hill indicates that he continued to reside there (MHR, Assessments, 1823-1825).

Thomas Berry was a successful planter in the 1812 to 1842 period. By the latter date he had added 131.25 ~~1/4~~ acres to his Oxon Hill property, although the new properties were much less valuable per acre. The Oxon Hill acreage had been

divided into an 865-acre tract valued at $40 per acre and a 443-acre tract valued at $12 per acre. He had apparently sold 20 of the 1,328 original acres. Berry now owned 32 slaves at Oxon Hill, along with 17 at Seat Pleasant. Average slaveholding in the Oxon Hill district, now called Spaldings Election District (#6 - ~~see~~ Figure 11), was only 3.0 per assessed owner. This low average, and the small number of slaves in the district strongly suggests that the region had suffered considerable decline, even if Berry himself had not. Berry's total personal wealth, including $40,743 in lands and his wealth in slaves, private securities, livestock, household furniture, plate, and gold and silver watches, was valued at $55,424. This was over 17 times the average $3,171 value of personal wealth in Spaldings District (MHR, Assessments, 1842).

At Seat Pleasant in the Bladensburg Election District (#2), Berry held 553 acres, 17 slaves and $16,165 total personal wealth. Average slaveholding in Bladensburg was 5.9 slaves; average personal wealth $6,026. Berry's father, Zachariah, also in Bladensburg, owned 4,862 acres, 55 slaves, and $65,510 total personal wealth. Only two men, Otho B. Beall and Thomas B. Crawford, owned more total wealth in the district. Immediately behind Zachariah came his eldest son, Zacharia Berry, Jr. (1781-1859), with 1,029 acres, 29 slaves, and $48,440 total personal wealth. Only

four men, including his father, were wealthier in Bladensburg District. Over in District 7, Queen Anne's, the future heir of Oxon Hill Manor, Thomas E. Berry (1815-1879), had already built a sizeable estate. Berry owned 434 acres at "Partnership," 19 slaves, and $24,708 total personal wealth. Although wealthy by county-wide standards, he was living in a district where average slaveholding was 12.6 slaves and average personal wealth $14,063 (MHR, Assessments, 1842).

When Zachariah Berry died in 1845, he left parts of his estate to his sons Thomas, Zachariah Jr., and Washington (Jeremiah had apparently died), to his daughter Mary Beall, and to various grandchildren and relatives. Zachariah, Jr. received the Concord and Outlet Enlarged homeplace, Thomas the Oxon Hill lands, and Thomas E. Berry, Zachariah, Sr.'s grandson, $3,000. At this time Thomas Berry had 11 slaves, 553 acres and a total wealth of $14,540 at Seat Pleasant and 21 slaves, 1,576 25/100 acres and $51,004 total personal wealth at the Oxon Hill and other District 6 properties. He had household furniture in both the Seat Pleasant and Oxon Hill areas ($150 at Seat Pleasant and $350 at Oxon Hill). Thomas E. Berry's Partnership estate in Queen Anne's showed 19 slaves and total wealth of $25,393, only a slight change from 1842 (MHR, Assessments, 1845; PGCC, Wills, P.C. 1, 1845, :pp. 284-289).

In 1847 Thomas Berry's Seat Pleasant estate showed considerable increase over 1845. He had added 658~~172~~ 5 acres (Sewalls Enlarged) inherited from Zachariah Berry, Sr. and had increased his slaveholdings from 11 to 24. Most of the increase in slaves probably came from the 15 slaves he received from Zachariah's estate. Thomas Berry's total wealth at Seat Pleasant and Sewalls Enlarged was $25,611, up over $10,000 from the $14,540 in Bladensburg District in 1845, and total personal wealth of $50,954, down slightly from the $51,004 in 1845. He continued to be the wealthiest householder in the Spaldings District. Thomas E. Berry's Partnership estate in Queen Anne's was identical to the 1845 estate (MHR, Assessments, 1847).

The year 1847 was also the year in which Thomas Berry separated from his wife, Mary Williams Berry. Because of "unhappy differences," the couple signed a formal separation and agreed "to live separate and apart from each other during the remainder of their lives." Berry's son and heir, Thomas E. Berry, would sign a similar agreement with his wife, Elizabeth Berry, in 1874. The 1847 settlement arranged for Mary to take full possession of the Seat Pleasant property, "for the most part" the same land she had inherited from her father in 1820. She also received 23 slaves, 40 hogs, 30 sheep, 8 oxen, 10 cows, 3 horses, 3 carts, 30 hogsheads of tobacco, 100 barrels of corn, 200

bushels of wheat, a carriage and horses, some "plows and gears," and the oat and rye currently planted. She was residing at Seat Pleasant at the time (MHR, Land Records, JBB 5/: p. 102, Nov. 10, 1847).

The items listed in the settlement between Thomas and Mary Berry in 1847 indicates that they practiced somewhat diversified farming at Seat Pleasant, rather than relying entirely on tobacco. The 1850 agricultural census provides our first good outline of Berry's agricultural activities at Oxon Hill Manor, and allows comparisons between his production and average and median levels in his district. Table 34 lists Berry's totals against average and median values. Immediately apparent is Berry's enormous wealth in land, farm value, and livestock. Also evident is the fact that he was not a tobacco planter. Rather than turning to market gardening as a substitute, Berry appears to have emphasized livestock, corn, and wheat, and, to a lesser extent, orchard products. His relatively high value of farm implements and the large number of oxen probably reflect his high levels of grain production. Insofar as the Spaldings District was moving toward market gardening, dairying, and increased tobacco production and away from livestock -- trends just beginning by 1850 according to the earlier analysis of district and county trends -- Berry was not a participant. The shift of grain and livestock toward the

Patuxent, generally, was not apparent at Oxon Hill Manor. There is little indication of the district's -- and the manor's -- later interest in Irish and especially sweet potatoes.

As Table 34 shows, the 1850 census lists Berry as the owner of 887 total acres rather than the 1,308 acres recorded by the 1850 tax assessment. ~~I have no~~ There is no immediate explanation for the discrepancy, except to note that the 887 acres roughly coincides with the 865-acre Oxon Hill Manor tract valued at $40 per acre. The other 443 acres was listed separately and valued at $12 per acre. Berry may have been leasing the 443 acres, although no leases by him are recorded in the county land records. Berry was working 24 slaves at the estate in 1850 and his total personal wealth was $50,954. District averages were 2.3 slaves per assessed owner and $2,579 personal wealth. Based on his personal wealth, Berry was the richest man in the district in 1850. He also owned 658~~1/2~~ 9 acres (Sewall's Enlarged) in Bladensburg District, but he had given up Seat Pleasant, the 24 slaves and other personal property in the settlement with his wife in 1847. Berry's older brother, Zachariah Berry, Jr. (Sr. since 1845), was the wealthiest individual in Bladensburg District, where he owned 47 slaves, 3,725 acres of land, and $78,621 total personal property (MHR, Assessments, 1847, 1850).

Berry's separation from his wife did not appear to reduce his social and economic status to any significant degree. Not only did he hang on to the valuable Oxon Hill estate, but he had also been elected as a magistrate of the Magistrate's Court for Spaldings Election District in 1845 (MHR, Land Records, JBB 4/: ~~p.~~ 218, July 12, 1845). Curiously, however, when he died intestate in 1854 or 1855 his estate was inventoried at only $1,510; the figure included two female slaves valued at $1,400, a carriage worth $50, and two gray horses worth $60 (MHR, Inventories, WAJ 1/: ~~p.~~ 189, January 17, 1855). It is possible that Berry divested himself of most of his property before his death, although the records do not indicate any such transactions. Nor can the tax assessments shed any light on the distribution of his property at his death; all assessments from 1851 through 1860 have been lost. When they reappear, in 1861, the owner of Oxon Hill Manor was Berry's son, Thomas E. Berry.

4. The Thomas E. Berry Years, 1860-1888.

The 1861 tax assessment indicates that Oxon Hill Manor had passed into the hands of Thomas E. Berry (1815-1879) by that date. He probably inherited the estate on his father's death in 1854 or 1855. Berry also owned a 600-acre tract,

"Thomas and Mary," and a 211-acre tract, "Pleasant Hill," in Spaldings District, and he had inherited 658.5 acres (Sewalls Enlarged) in Bladensburg District. He continued to hold his Partnership estate in Queen Anne's, now listed as 432 acres rather than 434 as previously noted (MHR, Assessments, 1861).

Determining where Thomas E. Berry was living in 1861 from the tax assessment records is difficult, since both his Spaldings and Queen Anne's properties showed personal property. A listing of Berry's property in 1861 may be helpful (MHR, Assessments, 1861):

2nd District (Bladensburg)

Sewells Enlarged	–	658.5 acres	– $6,585	
No personal property			Total	$ 6,585

6th District (Spaldings)

Oxon Hill Manor	–	865 acres	– $34,600	
Oxon Hill Manor	–	443 acres	5,316	
Thomas and Mary	–	600 acres	6,000	
Pleasant Hill	–	211 acres	2,110	
		2,119	48,026	
				$48,026
Slaves (55)			$8,420	

Railroad stock		8,000	
Livestock		1,844	
Household furniture		400	
Gold and silver watches		25	
Other property		500	
		19,189	
			$19,189
	Total for Spaldings		$67,215

7th District (Queen Anne's)

Partnership	-	432 acres	- $17,280	$17,280
Slaves (46)	-	$8,655		
Private securities	-	690		
Livestock	-	1,250		
Household furniture	-	500		
Plate	-	200		
Gold and silver watches	-	100		
Other property	-	500		
		11,895		$11,895
		Total for 7th District		$29,175

Total value of all property $102,975

The tremendous increase in Thomas E. Berry's wealth

since the 1850 tax assessment was the result of his having inherited property from his father, Thomas Berry, and from his uncle and father-in-law, Zachariah Berry Jr. (Sr. since 1845; eldest son of Zachariah Berry Sr.) in 1859. Although the exact inheritance pattern from his father is unclear, we know from the records that he inherited 8 slaves and $33,426 in property (one-fifth of the estate) from Zachariah Berry Jr. Zachariah Jr. left property to Thomas E. Berry and to Thomas' wife and Zachariah's daughter, Elizabeth Berry, which would later be divided up at the time of their separation agreement in 1874. The bulk of Thomas E. Berry's property, $67,215, was in Spaldings District. This value made him by far the wealthiest householder in the district. The 1860 census indicates that he owned 55 slaves in the district, almost eight times the average of 7.0. His 46 slaves in Queen Anne's District was only about double the average of 24 in that wealthier area. Berry's $67,215 personal wealth in Spaldings was over 28 times the average of $2,382; his $29,175 in Queen Anne's was about double the average of $12,090 (MHR, Wills, WAJ 1, p. 133; Bowie, p. 61; MHR, Assessment, 1861; 1850 Census).

Thomas E. Berry resided at his estate in Queen Anne's District, not at Oxon Hill in Spaldings. Since the listing of his property in the tax assessments indicates that he owned personal property in both districts, this would be a

difficult conclusion to arrive at from only the assessments. The only possible clue might lie in the absence of plate at the Spaldings properties, since both districts list household furniture and gold and silver watches.

The 1860 population census, however, does not include Thomas E. Berry in the Spaldings enumeration. He appears only in the population census of Queen Anne's. Both the agricultural and slave censuses list him in Spaldings. Other evidence that Berry did not live at Oxon Hill in the 1850s or later comes from the Chancery Court 1208 insanity case and from the 1871 tax assessment. In the insanity hearings Berry's "homeplace" is referred to as "Ellersbie", located in Queen Anne's District. That this is the same property as "Partnership" is indicated by both the insanity case and by the listing in 1871 of Berry's 432-acre estate in Queen Anne's as "Ellersbie". This is the same tract which had been referred to as "part of Partnership" from 1841 onward (1860b Census (Agriculture); 1860f Census (Population); 1860d Census (Slave); PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208; MHR, Assessment, 1841-1850, 1861, 1871).

The 1860 agricultural census provides data on Berry's agricultural practices at Oxon Hill as well as at Ellersbie in Queen Anne's District. Table 35 shows his production levels in the two districts and compares Oxon Hill production to the average and median for all producing

farmers (owners and tenants) in Spaldings District. Comparing Thomas E. Berry's activities to those of his father in 1850 (Table 34), it appears that by 1860 Berry had almost doubled the total acreage from 887 to 1,600 and had increased improved acreage from 587 to 700. Also, the value of the farm in 1860 was $60,000, compared to $40,000 in 1850. I ~~cannot explain~~ the differences in total acreage cannot be explained at this time. It is possible that census-takers included different lands or that neither census included only the Oxon Hill Manor property. In any case, Berry by 1860 showed considerably more livestock, and farm implements, and he was producing tobacco, unlike his father. The manor showed no values under orchard products, market gardening, or Irish potatoes, although it grew some oats. Both censuses showed similar levels of wheat and corn. Regarding diversification, Thomas E. Berry grew tobacco and oats at the expense of orchards and market gardening. Thomas Berry had produced no tobacco, but had shown values in orchards and market gardening. Thomas E. Berry also produced eight times as much hay as his father. Berry's Queen Anne's estate, Ellersbie, was smaller and less valuable than Oxon Hill Manor. The striking differences at this property were the enormous levels of tobacco production and the presence of values under animals slaughtered, Irish potatoes, butter, and sheep. Since the 1859 census year may not have been typical, the most

reliable statistic is undoubtedly the strong orientation toward tobacco. Table 36 shows Berry's activities in Queen Anne's in 1850. In that year he was more diversified than in 1850, producing more corn, oats, potatoes, and hay, less tobacco and livestock. He had owned swine in 1850, but did not in 1860.

Summarizing the agricultural data from 1850 and 1860, it is clear that livestock, grain, and to a lesser extent tobacco, dominated production at Oxon Hill. There is no discernible trend toward orchard production or market gardening, except in Thomas Berry's relatively high market gardening value in 1850. His son, however, showed no market gardening in 1860, despite impressive growth within Spaldings as a whole (~~See~~ Table 20). Moreover, Berry was less diversified in Queen Anne's in 1860 than in 1850, although tobacco was the dominant crop in both censuses.

Since Berry was producing only 4,000 pounds of tobacco in Spaldings in 1860, his laborers clearly were not much involved in the crop. Since he owned 55 slaves in the district, most of his slaves were working in grain or livestock activities. This pattern strongly supports the evidence presented earlier regarding agricultural diversification in St. Mary's County and in Green and Orange Counties, Virginia within a more or less stable or growing slave population. Berry's 55 slaves in Spaldings worked

within an agricultural system that produced only 4,000 pounds of tobacco while his 46 slaves in Queen Anne's were involved in 60,000 pounds harvested. Of course, Berry may have hired out some of his Spaldings slaves, a likely possibility for a slaveowner close to a major urban center. Still, hiring the slaves merely supports the aforementioned research which emphasizes the flexibility of slavery within a diversified agriculture (1860 c Census (Population); 1860 d Census (Slave); MHR, Assessments, 1861).

Figures 15 (Martenet, 1861 b) and 16 (Friis, 1968a, Figure 17) show the location of Thomas E. Berry's estate in 1861 and 1862, respectively. The manor house was located on a bluff above the Potomac, about a mile from the river. The Alexandria Ferry, formerly Clifford's (1775-88), Douglas's (1788-95), and Thomas's (1795-7) Ferry, and called Fox's Ferry during the Nineteenth century, was the estate and local community landing. It had also been the site of an "ordinary" since at least 1782, and a hotel operated there in the 1860s (Van Horn, 1976, pp. 184-85, 204--5, 221). Figure 16 reveals the extent to which the original manor property was still forested. For purposes of comparison with Figure 6 (1785) it should be recalled that the Berry property (1,328 acres) contained all of the original 828-acre dower.

Figure 17 (U. S. Coast Survey, 1863) is the only map

from before the 1895 fire which indicates the physical layout of the estate. It dates from 1863. Given the large number of slaves and livestock at the estate, the outbuildings are probably slave quarters, barns, and stables. The lack of tobacco production reduces the probability that they included tobacco barns. The small structure close and to the north of the manor house may have been a detached kitchen. The larger, more distant buildings were probably barns or stables for the 8 horses, 7 mules and asses, 8 oxen, 7 milch cows, 14 "other cattle", and 100 hogs on the estate in 1860.

Thomas E. Berry's social and economic status in the 1860s can be determined from the 1861 tax assessment. In Spaldings District he owned 1,308 acres at Oxon Hill, a 600-acre tract, "Thomas and Mary", and a 211-acre tract, "part of Pleasant Hill", all valued at $48,026. Oxon Hill Manor made up $39,916 of that total. He also owned 55 slaves, with $8,420, and $10,769 additional personal property. His total real and personal estate came to $67,215, by far the richest in Spaldings. The next closest total was only $13,275. Berry's 55 slaves was almost eight times the average 7 slaves for Spaldings slaveowners in 1860, while his $67,215 total wealth was nearly thirty times the $2,382 average for the district (MHR, Assessment, 1861).

At his Ellersbie home plantation (see Figure 18), Berry

was comparably less wealthy, although only because he owned only 432 acres of land, valued at $17,280. He also owned 46 slaves worth $8,655, and $3,240 additional personal property. His total real and personal estate was $29,175, ranking him only sixteenth in Queen Anne's. His 46 slaves was about double the 24 slave average for the district, and his $29,175 total wealth was only a little more than double the $12,090 average for Queen Anne's. Clearly, Thomas E. Berry must have struck a more imposing figure at Oxon Hill than of Ellersbie. This probably explains the reference to him as "Thomas E. Berry of Oxon Hill" in the best genealogy of the Berry family (Bowie, 1975, p. 61), rather than as "Thomas E. Berry of Ellersbie".

Until 1867, Oxon Hill Manor continued to be listed under Thomas E. Berry as 1,308 acres divided into 865 and 443-acre units. Valued at $40 and $12 per acre, respectively, the two units total value was $39,916. In 1868, however, Oxon Hill Manor lands totaled 1,800 acres, all valued at $30 per acre, for a total of $54,000. Berry's total wealth in the Spaldings District, including $10,000 for the 500-acre Thomas and Mary tract, was $64,000, by far the richest in the district. No personal property, however, was listed in Spaldings in 1868. ~~I have~~ There is no explanation for the change, although the fact that Berry's eldest son, T. Owen Berry (1843-?) appears in Spaldings for the first time

with $1,445 livestock is suggestive that his son may have begun occupying the Oxon Hill property. This possibility is enhanced by T. Owen's appearing in the 1870 Spaldings agricultural census as the "owner" of a $100,000 farm. At age 26, it is unlikely that T. Owen Berry was the ~~unlikely~~ "owner" of an estate of 2,150 acres with such an enormous value. It seems clear that he, like his uncle, Thomas Berry, was residing at his father's estate (MHR, Assessments, 1861-1868; 1870, Prince George's Manuscript Agriculture and Population Census).

Table 37 shows T. Owen Berry's agricultural production at Oxon Hill Manor in 1870 compared to average and median value for all producing farmers (owners and tenants) in Spaldings. The enormous differences between Berry's and the averages and medians is immediately impressive. The sum paid for wages, $3,500, and the value of all farm products, $9,500, present the impression of a large corporate farm. Berry was married, had male children aged 5 and 2, and had two domestic servants and two farm laborers in his household. Since tenant farms were not separated in the census until 1880, it is possible that some of the values included tenant production; that is, production from which Berry drew a share or derived an income in cash rent. There is no way to verify this possibility. Unlike his father in 1860 (Table 35), T. Owen was involved heavily in market gardening. Sweet and Irish potatoes were probably the basis

of his market gardening. He also showed 100 additional improved acres and 550 additional total acres, a large value for animals slaughtered, much more hay, and 150 sheep. He produced less wheat than his father and no tobacco. Unlike the district, but like his father, he earned no income from orchard products. The estate had 242 total livestock, compared to 144 in 1860. T. Owen had no oxen and fewer hogs (1870, Prince George's Manuscript Agricultural and Population Census). Oxon Hill in 1870 appears more in tune with the general trend in Spaldings than in 1860, although the estate produced disproportionately in livestock, animals slaughtered, corn, and sweet potatoes. It was under-represented in orchard products, tobacco, and milk. The estate also showed $3,000 "improvements" between the 1868 and 1871 tax assessments. The exact date of these additions is not certain, since tax assessments for 1869 and 1870 have been lost (MHR, Assessments, 1868, 1871).

By 1870 Thomas E. Berry had acquired and sold property in Bladensburg District, leaving him in possession of only "The Manor", a 700-acre tract. The 1870 census valued his 432-acre Ellersbie plantation in Queen Anne's at $108,960 real property and $2,000 personal, figures which appear to be in serious error. The scattered tax assessments from 1861 to 1871 consistently value Ellersbie at from $29,175 to $36,430. At current land values ($40 per acre maximum),

Ellersbie could not possibly have been worth $108,960. By 1871, however, the value of Berry's estate placed him third among all district householders, behind Oden Bowie and Charles H. Carter and up from sixteenth in 1861. Average wealth per householder in Queen Anne's was $7,791 (MHR, Assessments, 1861-1871; 1870, Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural and Population Censuses).

From George M. Hopkins's map of Prince George's County in 1878 we know that Oxon Hill Manor was being leased in that year to James E. Bowie. Figure 19 (Hopkins, 1878) reproduces the 1878 map. The map also associates "T. O. Berry", T. Owen Berry, with the property, a confirmation that Berry had been residing at or managing Oxon Hill. It is possible that T. Owen's association with Oxon Hill began in 1868, the year in which he appeared in the Spaldings tax assessments as the owner of $1,445 livestock and the year in which Thomas E. Berry no longer showed any personal property at the estate. Documentation from the 1870s and 1880s, moreover, reveals that Thomas E. Berry suffered from both financial difficulties and mental instability beginning in the early 1860s. The records also indicate that, in addition to Bowie, a number of other tenants had rented parts of Oxon Hill Manor. While no actual leases have survived, and while the documentation lists cash rental payments only for the 1880s, Bowie's presence as a tenant in

1878 suggests the possible presence of other tenants before the 1880s.

T. Owen Berry's activities at Oxon Hill are not altogether clear, although he was considered to be the manager of Oxon Hill by the tenants even before Thomas E. Berry's death in 1879. The absence of tax assessments between 1871 and 1888 prevents determination of his exact economic status. Moreover, he does not appear in the 1880 agricultural or population censuses for Prince George's County, even though he is recorded on the 1878 map (Figure 19) at Oxon Hill and at a residence southwest of the manor house and closer to the Alexandria Ferry. He also appears as a "farmer" under the town of Oxon Hill in the 1878 Maryland Directory, although not in subsequent directories of 1880, 1882, and 1887 (MHR, Assessments, 1871; p. 188; The Maryland Directory, 1878; p. 414, 1880, 1882; The Maryland Directory and State Gazetteer, 1887; 1880, Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural and Population Censuses).

Before examining the occupancy and agricultural activities at Oxon Hill Manor in more depth, the decline and death of Thomas E. Berry should be explained. In 1874 Berry and his wife, Elizabeth Berry, who was also his cousin (daughter of his uncle, Zachariah Berry -- see Figure 14), signed a formal agreement to separate permanently. Berry's wife petitioned the court for protection against her husband

who, she claimed, had been threatening violence against her and himself. She reported that her husband in the past seven or eight years had stopped treating her with the "kindness and confidence" of their earlier married years and she actually feared for her own and his life. She claimed his actions not on malice but on "mental derangement", and noted that for several years he had been displaying "fits of mental depression amounting almost to absolute insanity". He was both "violent and dangerous", she concluded.

Berry had already spent several months in an asylum by 1874, and he returned for a time in 1876. In 1876, however, his sons T. Owen and Norman petitioned the court for a writ of "De Lunatic Inquiriendo" because he had not improved. After medical examination and a jury hearing, Thomas E. Berry was declared legally insane ("non compos mentis"), and his estate entered into trusteeship in 1878. One of the trustees, Joseph K. Roberts, reported that in January of 1878, three months before the insanity declaration, Thomas E. Berry had come to his office in Upper Marlboro and had told him "that he was largely indebted, that he was making little or no money on his property, and that taxes, interest and expenses were consuming it all." Thomas E. ~~Berry~~ had come to Roberts to arrange to sell parts of his property to cover his own expenses and to properly arrange for his children's inheritances. He informed Roberts that he had already given

"a great sum of money" to T. Owen, that he wished Norman to be on an equal footing with his brother after Thomas E. died, and that he wished Norman to have the Ellersbie homeplace. Roberts refused to make these arrangements because Berry was "incoherent" and his mind "so weak as to render him incapable of making a valid deed".

Both Elizabeth Berry and the two sons believed that Berry was incapable of taking care of either himself or his property. They declared that he had been mismanaging his properties since 1859, in part by timbering certain lands and selling the wood at "grossly inadequate" prices. Elizabeth complained that his actions often left the lands wasted and useless. The family feared that Berry's debts, amounting to over $20,000, would lead his creditors to force sale of his property at considerable disadvantage to its actual value. The estate, they said, could easily cover the debts if handled properly. Once in trusteeship, the estate was subdivided into smaller parcels and sold piecemeal after 1879. The manor house and some of the lands around it were sold in 1888. Thomas E. Berry entered Mount Hope Retreat in Baltimore, where he died in 1879 (PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, 1874-1891).

At the time of Thomas E. Berry's insanity hearings, he continued to reside at Ellersbie in Queen Anne's District. The occupant of Oxon Hill Manor, according to the 1878

Hopkins map (Figure 19) was James E. Bowie. Documentation from the hearings indicate for certain that the estate leased estate tracts from 1878 to 1888; no earlier leases are actually recorded in the records. In addition to Bowie, tenants named were Richard W. Streeks, his son David Streeks, his wife Eliza Streeks, John Lanham and his wife Amelia Lanham, and George W. Lanham. From 1882 through 1886 Richard Streeks paid $1,470 in rent, George Lanham paid $1,630 from 1882 through 1888, and Amelia Lanham paid $895 from 1882 through 1888. No other information was given in the records. Richard Streeks, George Lanham, and James E. Bowie appear as tenants in the 1880 agricultural tax assessment for Spaldings District. Moreover, they are listed sequentially in the census with seven other tenants. An eighth possible Oxon Hill Manor tenant appears in the hearing records. Since census-takers enumerated by location, it can be speculated that this collection of eleven tenants were all at Oxon Hill Manor after 1878, and perhaps earlier. The discussion of tenancy at Oxon Hill Manor which follows operates on the certainty that Richard Streeks, George Lanham, and James E. Bowie were tenants and on the possibility that the eight others were at the manor (PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, 1874-1891; 1880, Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural and Population Censuses).

Table 38 lists the agricultural production levels for the known tenants -- Richard Streeks, George Lanham, and James E. Bowie -- and compares their values to the average for the eight possible tenants and to the average and median for all producing farmers (owners and tenants) in Oxon Hill District in 1880. As in the analysis of tenant agriculture in a previous section (Tables 27-31), it is immediately evident that Streeks and Lanham were relatively well-to-do farmers. Bowie, however, was not. Despite apparently having the resources to rent the manor, his production values almost all fall below median levels. The fact that he produced above both the average and median tobacco levels, did not seem to advance his prosperity. Streeks and Lanham show very high values in land farmed, farm value, livestock, market gardening, all farm products, corn, Irish potatoes (Streeks), and sweet potatoes. Bowie was also a large producer of sweet potatoes, one of the principal crops of Oxon Hill District by the 1870s. Apart from corn and some oats (Lanham), grains were not important to these three tenants. The averages for the other eight tenants are consistently lower than the averages and medians for the district, with the telling exception of market gardening. One of the tenants, George Streeks, showed high values similar to Richard Streeks and George Lanham, thereby pulling up the average for the eight tenants. Five of the

eight, however, showed market garden levels above the district average. It is also notable that they produced relatively high levels of sweet potatoes. As in the earlier censuses, orchard products were not important at Oxon Hill Manor.

Some additional information about the known tenants is available in the records. James E. Bowie was listed as a "farmer", as were all tenants, in the 1880 population census, age 43, and married since 1860 to the former Frances Whitmore (Brown, 1973, p. 25). Frances kept a house filled with seven children, aged one month to 18 years. The 18-year old son, James, was a farm laborer. Like all of the other tenants at Oxon Hill, Bowie was white. His production levels and the low value of his 50-acre farm suggest considerable economic difficulty for such a large family. Although his Irish potato and sweet potato levels were high, and although he was one of only 19 tobacco producers among 138 farmers in Oxon Hill District, he was unable to pay any wages for assistance. His four acres of tobacco must have taken up almost all of the labor of himself and his son (1880, Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural and Population Censuses). Bowie may have given up farming, as in 1887 he appeared in the Maryland Directory and State Gazetteer as a butcher in Oxon Hill (p. 447).

Richard Streeks, another tenant, paid him $60 to $400

annually between 1882 and 1887 to rent Oxon Hill lands. His 1880 production levels indicate reasonable prosperity derived from livestock, market gardening, and potatoes. He was married and had two children, one a farm laborer, son, and seven black farm laborers in his household. The blacks were probably boarders and the recipients of most of the $600 Streeks paid in wages in 1880. In 1884 Streeks was renting about 400 acres and specializing in sweet potatoes. In 1880 he had rented only 160 acres, with 100 in corn and 25 in potatoes. In 1884 his old potato house had "fallen down", and T. Owen and Norman Berry anxiously petitioned the court to free money for a new one. The court awarded the $200 requested. No location was indicated in the records. Despite Streeks's apparent economic success, the trustee of the estate foreclosed on him in 1887 for failure to pay $965 back rent. Streeks was forced to sell his personal property for $510.50 (PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, 1874-1891). Although the sixth largest of 108 market gardeners in Oxon Hill District in 1880, Richard Streeks was bankrupt by 1887.

George Lanham, the third known tenant, was one of Oxon Hill District's most prosperous farmers. Renting 225 acres of land, he operated a farm worth $8,000, eight times that of James E. Bowie and almost triple that of the average district farmer -- including farm owners. His farm was among the top six percent in the district, ranking fourth among

138 farms by value. The highest valued farm was only worth $11,245 in 1880. Married with only two children, a white servant and a mail carrier [?] in his household, Lanham earned his income from corn, oats (a rare producer in the district), livestock, sweet potatoes and market gardening. Only one other farmer earned as much income as Lanham from market gardening, a landowner who also produced $2,000 (1880, Prince George's Manuscript Agricultural and Population Census; PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, 1874-1891).

Two of the known tenants at Oxon Hill Manor and one possible tenant were economically much better off than the average or median farmers in Oxon Hill District in 1880 and significantly better off than the average tenant. As illustrated by the fate of Richard Streeks, their positions may have been tenuous at times. Yet they were not unique, as previous analysis of Oxon Hill and Spaldings District for 1880 has shown (See Tables 27-31). Assuming that all eleven tenants included in Table 38 were at Oxon Hill, the absence of T. Owen Berry can be explained by the fact that collectively they were renting 585 of Oxon Hill Manor's 800 improved acres (1870 census) and 731 of 2,150 total acres. It seems probable that the 800 improved acres represented the original 828 acres of dower lands or the 879 acres purchased by Zachariah Berry in 1810; the additional 1,350

acres have included lands not part of the 449 acres which Berry purchased that year.

The absence of tax assessments from 1871 to 1888 makes tracing the changes at Oxon Hill Manor during these years quite difficult. The 1888 assessment, still listing Thomas E. Berry as owner, included $5,000 in "improvements." The estate totaled 1,620.75 acres valued at $25 per acre for a total of $38,088. The improvements are not specified, although some of the expenditures were included among various receipts in the insanity hearings documentation. Some refer to "Oxon Hill farm," others to unspecified properties which may have been Oxon Hill. In 1875 Thomas E. Berry paid $73.60 for "getting out" the sills and putting in 184 feet of new sills under a barn. In 1876 he paid $150 to Davy Miles for a new stable and an additional sum for "shingling and boarding a barn." In 1879 the estate paid William J. Latimer to survey Berry's properties. This survey is referred to in various deed transactions and was supposed to be with the Chancery Case #1208 papers, but research has not located the survey. In 1880 and 1881 the estate paid sums for "Oxon Hill farm" and in 1881 for windows, well repairs and cleaning, "Virginia" flooring, well buckets, and shingles. Also, in 1881, money was advanced for nails and lumber for a stable.

In 1884 the court awarded $200 for Richard Streeks' new

potato house and T. Owen Berry paid $22.84 "for raising and repairing" a barn on "Oxon Hill farm." In 1885 the court granted permission to dig a new well closer to the house than the old one. The "old pump" was described as being "some distance from the house and very much out of repair." Water was apparently collected from a cistern, also decayed, somewhere near the house. It was described as "the cistern at the house and heretofore used," but "out of repair and now useless." Money was also awarded for a number of repairs in the house to correct leaking. Also in 1885, the estate paid sums to George W. Lanham, a tenant, for hauling brick. The brick may have been used to line the well authorized the same year (PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, ~~pp.~~ 1874-1891).

The sums included in the insanity hearings documentation do not remotely approach the $5,000 total for improvements in the 1888 assessment. Of course the records are not necessarily complete. The changes recorded, however, suggest that both Berry himself and his sons and the trustees were interested in at least maintaining and probably improving the property. They were probably not successful, however, since the estate was valued at only $25 per acre in 1888, down from $30 in 1868.

While these changes were occurring the estate was also beginning to sell parcels of land laid out by the 1879

Latimer survey. In 1880 the entire estate was put up for sale as a 1,422-acre property. It was made up of an 820-acre section called "Oxon Hill" (the original dower) and divided into eight lots, and a 600-acre unit called the "Woodland" and divided into 41 lots. By this date, however, Dr. John W. Bayne, the neighbor at nearly "Salubria," had already purchased Lot 5 (42 acres), although the land records show this purchase as 42~~.273~~.67 acres acquired in 1881 (MHR, Land Records, WAJ 1~~,~~: ~~p.~~ 650, May 11, 1881). In addition, the land records indicate that Berry had sold 12 acres to Charles Williams Cox and 22 acres, called "Drovers Rose" to Wilhelmina Bender, both in 1877. The latter property was along the road from the Alexandria Ferry to Upper Marlboro (MHR, Land Records, HB 12, p. 175, March 21, 1877 and HB 12~~,~~: ~~p.~~ 393, April 25, 1877).

During the 1880s and preceding the sale of the manor house to Samuel Taylor Suit in 1888, the estate sold several parcels. In 1881 Samuel A. Pitts bought Lot 26 (20~~.778~~.88 acres) along the road from Alexandria to Upper Marlboro (MHR, Land Records, WAJ 2~~,~~: ~~p.~~ 22, Sept. 6, 1881); in 1886 William P. Jackson bought 97~~.172~~.5 acres (no lot number indicated); in 1887 John Warren Cox purchased Lot 17 (11~~.16/100~~.16 acres), and Lot 10 (15 acres), Charles W. Cox Lot 16 (9~~.55/100~~.55 acres), and Lot 38 (17~~.1710~~.1 acres); and in 1888 William S. Talbert acquired Lot 19 (19 acres) and Lot 20 (15

acres) and James A. Gregory Lot 22 (15 acres). The total sold after the 1879 survey was approximately 262.5 acres. Subtracting this sum for the 1,422 acres listed in 1880 left an estate of 1,159.5 acres (PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, 1874-1891). This is an incomplete procedure, however, since the estate purchased on May 23, 1888, was 1,280.16 acres. In 1891 the estate was advertised for sale as 1,222 acres, although the deed for sale when it was sold showed 1,233.71 acres (MHR, Land Records, JWB 18: pp. 359-370). Part of Lot 3 within the 8-lot manor house unit had been sold to B.L. Jackson and brother between 1888 and 1891.

The sale of the manor in 1888 ended the Berry family era at Oxon Hill Manor. By this date Thomas E. Berry had died and his property had been sold or dispersed. His hope that his son, Norman, would have his Ellersbie plantation was fulfilled. Norman purchased it in 1880, although it had been reduced from its long-standing 432 acres to 312 acres by 1888. Norman also owned "Marietta," a 222-acre tract in Vansville District which his father had given him in 1876 (MHR, Land Records, HB 12 p. 278, March 31, 1877; Assessments, 1888). This research I have been unable to determine the whereabouts of Berry's wife, Elizabeth, or, of his eldest son, T. Owen Berry.

5. Speculation and the New Oxon Hill Manor, 1888-1970.

The division of Oxon Hill Manor into units of eight and 41 lots in 1879 initiated an era of rapid turnover of the lands once collected as a 3,663-acre and a 1,328-acre estate. By 1888 at least 9 lots had been sold. When Colonel Samuel Taylor Suit purchased the bulk of the remaining estate, over 1,280 acres, in that year, his acquisition did not include an additional 13 lots unaccounted for in the deed records or the insanity hearings records. Colonel Suit resided in Spaldings District near the present town of Suitland, presumably named after him. Born in Bladensburg in the 1830's, he had made his fortune -- and acquired his honorary "colonel" -- in Louisville, Kentucky, where he operated a distillery. He returned to Prince George's County in 1867, purchased, resold, and repurchased Thomas E. Berry's "Thomas and Mary" property in Spaldings, and opened a distillery in Suitland. In 1880 he owned a 375-acre farm in Suitland valued at $75,000. His operation was namely an enormous orchard with 2,000 apple trees producing 5,000 bushels on 50 acres and 20,000 peach trees producing 6,500 bushels on 150 acres. He paid $1,224 in wages in the 1879 census year and was by far the wealthiest farmer in Spaldings District (1880, Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census; Norton,

acres to Oxon Hill Estates, Inc. in 1954. In 1969 this corporation sold 149.8 of the 187 acres, including the old manor site, to Oxon Hill Estates Straw Corporations. (See tract P3 of Figure 25.) Burpac sold 8 of its 55 acres, including the new manor, to International Capital Corporation in 1970 (P80 of Figure 25); the remaining 47 acres (P4 of Figure 25) was sold to Financial Realty Corporation the same year (for details and documentation, see Chain of Title).

6. Summary.

Throughout most of its history, Oxon Hill Manor appears to have been one of Maryland's most impressive and valuable agricultural estates. Originating in the seventeenth century, by the time of the American Revolution it featured an enormous mansion, dozens of slaves, a carriage and horses with liveried outriders, and a level of wealth and prominence which placed its owners among Maryland and Virginia's most powerful families. While we have no evidence that George Washington slept there, it is likely that he visited the estate since he was personally familiar with the owners and their families. He is known to have attended St. John's Church on Broad Creek from Mt. Vernon, where the Reverend Henry Addison served as minister from

1742 to 1789. The Reverend Walter Dulany Addison, the last Addison owner of Oxon Hill Manor, was one of the attending ministers at Washington's 1799 funeral. Moreover, the nation's "first" president, John Hanson, died in the house in 1783 while visiting his nephew, Thomas Hawkins Hanson. Although he slept and died there, it is unlikely, however, that he was buried there.

From extreme wealth and prominence, the estate slipped into relative decline from its illustrious pre-Revolutionary heights. The Revolution, divided management and litigation, and perhaps economic difficulties saw the estate's slave plantation character give way to a more tenant-oriented operation. When Walter Dulany Addison took over in 1793 he had only a fraction of his father's slaves. Moreover, he immediately began to sell parts of the estate and, possibly, to free his slaves. Disposal of the estate took some time, but the sale of 1,328 acres and the manor house to Zachariah Berry was the key transaction. By 1820 Addison had rid himself of all of the manor.

Zachariah Berry was a very wealthy tobacco planter from a more tobacco-oriented part of Prince George's County. We know little about him except that, unlike Walter Dulany Addison, he was active in the pursuit of wealth. He turned Oxon Hill Manor over to his son, Thomas Berry, in 1812, and the son maintained the estate at roughly the same size

(1,308 acres) until his death in 1854 or 1855. Although he did not own the property until Zachariah's death in 1845, it is unlikely that he felt limited as an active planter. The estate grew in value, although it never possessed the number of slaves present in the 1770s. The fact that it was 1,308 acres, not 3,663, may account in part for the smaller slave population. Probably of equal importance, however, was the fact that the agricultural economy of the area suffered decline or stagnation during most of the period after 1790. The poor conditions may have ruined Walter Dulany Addison, and probably established limits on Thomas Berry.

Not until 1850 do we have a detailed outline of agricultural activities at Oxon Hill Manor for the nineteenth century. The estate practiced a more diversified agriculture in 1850 than might be expected, relying more heavily on livestock, grain, and to a lesser extent, orchard products, than on the traditional tobacco. Research on colonial Maryland and comparative studies on nineteenth century agriculture suggest that such diversification was not unusual within the areas historians traditionally associate with tobacco. Moreover, research on Oxon Hill Manor has not shown clearly the nature of agricultural activities before 1850. Eighteenth century inventories show considerable livestock and the presence of wheat, but little else. Data from the 1880s refers to clearing land for

tobacco.

Under the ownership of Thomas E. Berry after 1854 or 1855, the estate moved steadily toward diversification. Berry restored tobacco in 1860, but none was produced in 1870. A tenant, James E. Bowie, grew tobacco in 1880. More dominant, however, was the growth of market gardening, a trend which anticipated the fragmenting of the estate in the 1880s. Even without Berry's insanity, it is doubtful that the plantation would have maintained its size within the general trend toward smaller, more intensively cultivated farms after 1850. While the estate under Thomas E. Berry (1860), his son, T. Owen Berry (1870), and various tenants (1880) moved toward market gardening (especially sweet potatoes), it continued to produce a great deal of corn and to own considerable livestock. The 1870 production levels were high in wheat, butter, and hay, unlike 1880. The 1870 estate paid $3,500 in wages, suggesting a type of corporate operation. By 1880 the property appears to have been turned over largely to tenants. The continued importance of livestock, corn, and perhaps, dairying and wheat, ran counter to county and district trends. In the county, livestock and grain drifted away from the D. C. area and toward the Patuxent River. Another counter-trend was the lack of attention to orchard products at the manor. Whatever the mix of production, the lands lost value after

1868, declining from $30 per acre in that year to $25 in 1888. The dower area had been assessed at $40 per acre until 1867.

While the estate and its owner, Thomas E. Berry, went into economic decline after 1870, such was not the case before that date. In the nineteenth century those associated with the manor -- Zachariah, Thomas, Thomas E. and related Berrys -- consistently appeared among the richest men in Prince George's County, a county which had produced six governors by 1878. Oxon Hill Manor and its unsung slaves, laborers, and tenants were a part of that wealth; but these Berrys also derived their wealth from other properties. Given their economic pre-eminance, it is striking that they appear so rarely in the political documentation of the nineteenth century. This is a dramatic contrast with the Addisons of the pre-Revolutionary years.

Research for this report was only minimal on the years following the destruction of the manor house in 1895. As a study of our extremely significant Maryland plantation, this approach seems justified in view of the effective demise of the plantation by the late nineteenth century. Diligent genealogists, local historians, and relatives of the families have performed their usual service in keeping the estate alive in our historical memory, albeit in an often too antiquarian manner. No small credit is also due Sumner

Welles who, perhaps inadvertently, made a similar contribution with his new Oxon Hill Manor.

CHAIN OF TITLE

Grantor: Royal Government
Grantee: John Addison
Date: 1787
Property: not indicated
Terms: not indicated
Source: Mackintosh, 1974, p. 75, Maryland Historical Trust, Annapolis
Comments: St. Elizabeth, the original grant from which Oxon Hill Manor was created, was granted to John Charmen in 1662 (Kellock, 1962, pp. 58-59).

Grantor: Colonel John Addison
Grantee: Colonel Thomas Addison
Date: 1705 or 1706
Property: not specified
Terms: will
Source: Carr and Jordan, 1974, pp. 232-234; MacKintosh, 1974, p. 75
Comments: Colonel John Addison owned 6,478.5 acres of land at his death; the acreage in the future Oxon Hill Manor is not indicated.

Grantor: Colonel Thomas Addison
Grantee: Captain John Addison
Date: April 9, 1722 and June 28, 1727
Property: 3,863 acres
Terms: will
Source: MHS, Manuscript Collection, Addison Family Papers
Comments: The property bequeathed to John Addison was made up of 8 original land grants, totalling 3,863 acres. The largest, St. Elizabeth, was 1,430 acres.

Grantor: Captain John Addison
Grantee: Thomas Addison
Date: 1764
Property: 3,663 acres
Terms: will
Source: Bowie, 1975, p. 33; MHR, Patented Certificate #1590, 1767
Comments: The 1767 "resurvey" gave the property its name, "Oxon Hill Manor.

Grantor: Thomas Addison
Grantee: Walter Dulany Addison
Date: June 22, 1771 and March 14, 1775
Property: 3,663 acres
Terms: will
Source: Bowie, 1975, pp. 37-38; MHR, Chancery Papers 128, 1784-1785
Comments: Walter Dulany Addison was a minor (b.1769) when his father died in 1774.

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison estate
Grantee: Rebecca Addison Hanson and Thomas Hawkins Hanson
Date: May 20, 1782
Property: 828 acres, including manor house
Terms: court award of dower
Source: MHR, Chancery Records 13, p. 156; Chancery Papers 128, 1784-1785; Magruder, 1967, p. 11.
Comments: Hansons sued estate for award of dower; the court granted 828 acres, including the house, considered to be one third of Thomas Addison's estate by value. John Addison, Thomas' brother, had received 100 acres of the estate at an unspecified date before 1782.

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Peter Savary
Date: 1790
Property: 65 acres
Terms: £308
Source: MHR, Land Records, II2, pp. 369, 1790
Comments: part of Oxon Hill Manor (Lowest Thicket)

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Rebecca Hanson
Date: 1793-1797 - not specified
Property: 400 acres (approximate)
Terms: gift
Source: Murray, 1895, pp. 89-90
Comments: part of Hart Park tract

Grantor: Thomas and Rebecca Hanson
Grantee: Nathaniel Washington
Date: October 3, 1797
Property: 400 acres (approximately)
Terms: not specified
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 6, p. 80
Comments: part of Hart Park

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Henry Addison
Date: October 6, 1797
Property: 500 acres
Terms: £300
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 6, p. 173
Comments: sold at low price out of "love and affection" to his brother

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Nicholas Lingan
Date: October 27, 1797
Property: part of Oxon Hill, acreage unspecified
Terms: £2,280
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 6, p. 86

Comments: sold 269' ~~3/4~~ acres, part from Oxon Hill Manor and part from "Force," a separate tract.

Grantor: Nathaniel Washington
Grantee: Walter Dulany Addison
Date: March 12, 1803
Property: 400 acres (approximately)
Terms: not specified
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 10 ~~p.~~ 145
Comments: part of Hart Park

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Francis Edward Hall Rozer
Date: December 5, 1805
Property: 15 acres
Terms: not specified
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 11 ~~p.~~ 238
Comments: part of Oxon Hill Manor

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Thomas Hawkins Hanson and Rebecca Hanson
Date: March 12, 1807
Property: 820 acres (approximately)
Terms: £2,200 Maryland currency
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 12 ~~p.~~ 205
Comments: this property was the dower, surveyed as 828 acres in 1785 and indicated as approximately 820 acres here.

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Zachariah Berry
Date: March 16, 1810
Property: 449 acres
Terms: unspecified
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 13 ~~p.~~ 625
Comments: reference in deed to another part of Oxon Hill Manor sold to Dr. DeButts and to a recent survey by George Fenwick.

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Zachariah Berry
Date: March 17, 1810
Property: 879 acres
Terms: L-16 per acre, current Maryland money
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 13 ~~p.~~ 627
Comments: this acreage included the manor house, although it is not mentioned in the deed; associated with the 449 acres sold March 16, 1810; excluded the "burying ground" and two acres to be transferred to John [Davies].

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Henry Bryan
Date: May 13, 1815

Property: one-half acre
Terms: $60
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 16, pp. 670
Comments: east of main road leading from the "Lodge" by Philip Spaldings

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Elsworth Bayne
DAte: January 1, 1817
Property: 326 or 328 acres
Terms: $4,911
Source: MHR, Land Records, JRM 17, pp. 145, 242; Assessments, 1817
Comments: land sold in two parcels, 261 acres and 65 acres (326); 1817 assessment shows 328 acres; sale terminates 1798 lease to Ebsworth and John Bayne; site of "Salubria".

Grantor: Walter Dulany Addison
Grantee: Unknown
Date: 1818-1820
Property: 458,~~75~~ ~~74~~ acres
Terms: unknown
Source: MHR, Assessments, 1818-1820
Comments: between 1818 and 1820, Addison lost possession of 458,~~174~~ acres listed in 1818; 1819 assessment showed 128,~~174~~ acres; no transactions in county deeds.

Grantor: Zachariah Berry
Grantee: Thomas Berry
Date: 1845
Property: 1,308 acres
Terms: will
Source: MHR, Wills, PC 1, pp. 284-289
Comments: since 1810, 20 of the 1,328 acres had been sold; no recorded transactions

Grantor: Thomas Berry
Grantee: Thomas E. Berry
Date: 1854 or 1855
Property: 1,308 acres
Terms: unknown
Source: MHR, Inventories, WAJ 1, pp. 189, January 17, 1855; Bowie, 1975, pp. 60; MHR, Assessments, 1861.
Comments: Thomas Berry died intestate; the Oxon Hill Manor estate appeared as Thomas E. Berry's property in the 1861 assessment; no assessments available 1851-1860.

Grantor: Thomas E. Berry
Grantee: Charles William Cox
Date: March 21, 1877
Property: 12 acres
Terms: not specified

Source: MHR, Land Records, HB 12, p. 175
Comments: probably part of Oxon Hill Manor

Grantor: Thomas E. Berry
Grantee: Wilhelmina Bender
Date: April 25, 1877
Property: 22 acres
Terms: $800
Source: MHR, Land Records, HB 12, p. 393
Comments: along road from Alexandria Ferry to Upper Marlboro

Grantor: Thomas E. Berry estate
Grantee: John W. Bayne
Date: May 11, 1881
Property: 42 ~~2/3~~ acres, Lot 5
Terms: $1,282.41
Source: MHR, Land Records, WAJ 1, p. 650; PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, Case #1208, 1874-1891
Comments: Case #1208 shows purchase as 42 acres, Lot 5, 1879

Grantor: Thomas E. Berry estate
Grantee: Samuel A. Pitts
Date: September 6, 1881
Property: 20 ~~7/8~~ acres, Lot 26
Terms: $313.05
Source: MHR, Land Records, WAJ 2, p. 22
Comments: unknown

Grantor: Thomas E. Berry estate
Grantee: William P. Jackson, John Warren Cox, Charles W. Cox, William S. Talbert, James A. Gregory
Date: 1888-1889
Property: 97.5 ~~1/2~~ acres (no lot given), 11.16 ~~16/100~~ acres (Lot 17) and 15 acres (Lot 10), 9.55 ~~55/100~~ acres (Lot 16) and 17.17 ~~17/10~~ acres (Lot 38), 19 acres (Lot 19), 15 acres (Lot 22)
Source: PGCC, Chancery Papers, Case #1208, 1874-1891
Comments: sales of lots from the subdivision established by the 1879 William J. Latimer Survey; no details included.

Grantor: Thomas E. Berry estate
Grantee: Samuel Taylor Suit
Date: May 23, 1888
Property: 1,280.16 ~~16/100~~ acres
Terms: unknown
Source: MHR, Land Records, JWB 18, pp. 359-370, May 14, 1891
Comments: no recorded deed for 1888

Grantor: Rosa P. Suit
Grantee: John C. Heald
Date: May 14, 1791

Property: 1,233.71~~/100~~ acres
Terms: $30,000
Source: MHR, Land Records, JWB 18, ~~pp.~~ 359-370
Comments: Thomas E. Berry estate sued Rosa P. Suit, widow of Samuel Taylor Suit, for non payment; on May 14, 1891 she was made legally responsible for the debt and she sold to Heald the same day; 1,280~~/100~~ acres reduced to 1,233.71~~/100~~ because B. L. Jackson and Brother purchased 46~~.45/100~~ acres (no deed) of Lot 3.

Grantor: John C. and Emma B. Heald
Grantee: United States Government
Date: July 31, 1891
Property: 143.98~~/100~~ acres
Terms: $12,109.07
Source: MHR, Land Records, JWB 21, ~~p.~~ 55
Comments: part in Prince George's County and part in District of Columbia; south of road from Upper Marlboro to the Alexandria Ferry; reference to sale of land called "Gregory's Discovery", close to Oxon Hill Manor and to Joseph Thomas' former lands (see February 10, 1892 deed).

Grantor: John C. and Emma B. Heald
Grantee: Reuben L. Coleman, Charles M. Swift, Charles T. Havener
Date: February 10, 1892
Property: 1,077.38~~/100~~ acres
Terms: $5
Source: MHR, Land Records, JWB 20, ~~p.~~ 412
Comments: reference to possible previous sale of 12.35~~/100~~ acres along Oxon Creek and Potomac River and inside D.C. boundary (See Figure 20)

Grantor: Charles M. and Clara B. Swift
Grantee: Reuben L. Coleman, Charles T. Havener
Date: August 2, 1893
Property: 773.71~~/100~~ acres
Terms: $5
Source: MHR, Land Records, JWB 25, ~~pp.~~ 606
Comments: Lot 1, 486.6~~3/3~~ acres, does not account for July 31, 1891 sale to U.S. Government.

Grantor: Charles T. and Helen M. Havener
Grantee: Reuben L. Coleman
Date: May 17, 1894
Property: 773.71~~/100~~
Terms: $5
Source: MHR, Land Records, JWB 29, ~~p.~~ 430
Comments: sale of half interest in property purchased February 10, 1892

Grantor: Reuben L. and Emma P. Coleman

Grantee: Rock Creek Land Company (William H. Miller, John C. Heald)
Date: January 21, 1905
Property: 773.71~~/100~~ acres
Terms: $10
Source: MHR, Land Records, 21, p. 359
Comments: none

Grantor: Rock Creek Land Company (William H. Miller, John C. Heald)
Crantee: Emma P. Coleman
Date: January 29, 1907
Property: 773.71~~/100~~ acres
Terms: $18,000
Source: MHR, Land Records, 38, p. 447
Comments: none

Grantor: R. Lindsay Coleman
Grantee: Charles A. Rhodes
Date: February 10, 1913
Property: 215.6~~/10~~ acres
Terms: $10
Source: MHR, Land Records, 87, p. 231
Comments: all of lot 7 and part of lot 1

Grantor: R. Lindsay Coleman
Grantee: Charles A. Rhodes
Date: February 10, 1913
Property: 94.77~~/100~~ acres
Terms: $10
Source: MHR, Land Records, 87, p. 231
Comments: part of lot 1

Grantor: Mary V. Parran
Grantee: R. Lindsay Coleman
Date: February 16, 1913
Property: all "Oxon Hill" property
Terms: $10
Source: MHR, Land Records, 84, p. 477
Comments: Parran is heir to estate of Emma P. Coleman

Grantor: John Craigan Parran, et al.
Grantee: William K. Quinter, Thomas C. Coleman
Date: June 12, 1917
Property: 356.37~~/100~~ acres
Terms: unknown
Source: MHR, Land Records, 128, p. 1
Comments: Parran, et al. empowered Quinter and Coleman to be trustees for estate of R. Lindsay Coleman, who died intestate in July, 1914; property in dispute.

Grantor: William K. Quinter and Thomas C. Coleman

Grantee: Sumner and Mathilde T. Welles
Date: July 20, 1927
Property: 245.17 acres
Terms: $110 per acre
Source: PGCC, Land Records, 293/p. 122
Comments: two parts of lot 1, all of lot 2, part of lot 3 (See Figure 23)

Grantor: Sumner and Harriet Post Welles
Grantee: Fred N. Maloof
Date: October 15 and 28, 1952
Property: 55.4 acres plus .68/100 acres
Terms: $175,000
Source: PGCC, Land Records, 1554/pp. 360, 365; MacKintosh, 1974/p. 68.
Comments: the .68/100 acres had been added in 1944; Mathilde Welles had died; acreage included New Oxon Hill Manor.

Grantor: Sumner and Harriet Post Welles
Grantee: Kennith [sic] Frank
Date: December 13, 1952
Property: 187.3 acres
Terms: none
Source: MacKintosh, 1974/p. 68; PGCC, Land Records, 1567/p. 329
Comments: none

Grantor: Fred N. Maloof
Grantee: Burpac Corporation
Date: August 28, 1967
Property: 55.4 acres
Terms: $1.2 million
Source: MacKintosh, 1974/p. 68; PGCC, Land Records, 3506/p. 193
Comments: included new Oxon Hill Manor

Grantor: Kenneth Frank
Grantee: Roberto Motta
Date: January, March 1953
Property: 187.3 acres
Terms: -
Source: MacKintosh, 1974/p. 69; PGCC, Land Records, 1569/p. 293 and 1586/p. 100.
Comments: included old Oxon Hill Manor site

Grantor: Roberto Motta
Grantee: Oxon Hill Estates, Inc.
Date: September 13, 1954
Property: 187.3 acres
Terms: -
Source: MacKintosh, 1974/p. 69; PGVV, Land Records, 1773/p. 578
Comments: -

Grantor: Oxon Hill Estates, Inc.
Grantee: Oxon Hill Estates Straw Corporation
Date: October 6, 1969
Property: 149.8 acres
Terms: -
Source: MacKintosh, 1974, p. 69; PGCC, Land Records, 3775, p. 289
Comments: included old Oxon Hill Manor Site on 92.7 (See Figure 25, tract P3)

Grantor: Burpac Corporation
Grantee: International Capital Corporation
Date: August 3, 1970
Property: 8 acres
Terms: -
Source: MacKintosh, 1974, pp. 69-70, 77; PGCC, Land Records, 3856, p. 402
Comments: included the new Oxon Hill Manor (See Figure 25, tract P 80)

Grantor: Burpac Corporation
Grantee: Financial Realty Corporation
Date: August 3, 1970
Property: 47.4 acres
Terms: -
Source: MacKintosh, 1974, pp. 69-70, 77; PGCC, Land Records, 3856, p. 406
Comments: tract surrounding new Oxon Hill Manor (See Figure 25, tract P4)

Other Properties (MacKintosh, 1974, p. 22; See Figure 25):

P5 - 10.65 acres, John W. Miller
P7 - 27.48 acres, J. Breckenridge Bayne
P8 - 7.25 acres, J. B. Castle
P9 - 196.23 acres, Smoot Sand and Gravel Company
P11 - 0.85 acres, Fred N. Maloof
P17 - 9.17 acres, Board of Education
P18 - 22.50 acres, J. Breckenridge Bayne
A - North Potomac View subdivison
B - River Ridge Estates subdivision
R/W - State and Interstate Rights of Way, present and proposed

Table 1. Percentage/Distribution of Gross Estates in Maryland.

Size of Estate	1690-1699	1710-1719	1730-1739	1750-1759
0-100 pounds	72.5	69.4	59.9	50.8
100-1,000 pounds	25.7	28.2	36.7	41.9
1,001 and above pounds	1.7	2.1	3.4	7.2

Source: Land 1981:162

Tables have been corrected

Table 2. Percentage of Slaves on Plantations of Various Sizes

Period	1-2 Slaves	3-5 Slaves	6-10 Slaves	11-20 Slaves	21+ Slaves
1658-1710	12	17	22	21	28
1721-1730	6	11	19	20	44
1731-1740	6	11	26	34	24
1741-1750	5	9	18	22	48
1751-1760	3	8	17	28	44
1761-1770	4	9	22	31	35
1771-1779	2	8	17	18	55
1776	7	13	24	25	32
1790	3	8	13	23	52

Source: Kulikoff 1976:185-186

Table 3. Distribution of Landownership in Prince George's County, 1756 and 1771

No. Acres	% Landowners 1756	% Landowners 1771
1-49	5.5	5.8
50-99	11.5	9.4
100-149	20.1	20.5
150-199	10.4	10.6
200-249	11.1	11.8
250-299	7.5	5.2
300-399	9.3	10.1
400-499	5.7	5.8
500-599	5.1	6.2
600-699	6.9	7.1
1000-1499	3.2	3.1
1500 and over	3.8	4.5
	100.1	100.1

Source: Kulikoff 1976:201-202

Table 4. Comparison of Inventories of Thomas Addison (1727), John Addison (1765), and Thomas Addison (1775), Oxon Hill Manor

Category	1727	1765	1775
# Quarters	7	3	2
Total Slaves	75	41	109
Slaves at Manor House	23	24	60
Value of Personal Property	£3,657	£2,363	£5,275
Value of Slaves	£1,867	£1,362	£2,905
Slaves as % of Personal Property	51	58	55
Cattle	289	56	98
Horses	14	20	28
Sheep	48	66	120
Hogs	0	98	101

Source: Maryland Historic Records, Inventories 1727; 1765; 1775

Table 5. Agricultural Production in Maryland, 1840-1860

	1840	1850	% Change	1860	% Change
Farms	--	21,860	--	25,244	15.5
Improved Acres	--	2,797,905	--	3,002,267	7.3
Average Farm Acreage	--	212	--	192	-10.4
Value of Farms	--	87,178,545	--	145,973,677	67.4
Value of Farm Implements	--	2,463,443	--	4,010,529	62.9
Value of Livestock	--	7,997,634	--	14,667,853	83.4
Value of Orchard Products	114,339	164,051	43.5	252,196	53.7
Value of Market Gardens	133,197	200,869	50.8	530,221	164.0
Wheat (bushels)	3,511,433	4,494,680	28.0	6,103,480	35.8
Rye (bushels)	824,333	226,014	-72.6	518,901	129.6
Corn (bushels)	8,470,165	10,749,858	26.9	13,444,922	25.1
Oats (bushels)	3,579,950	2,242,151	-37.4	3,959,298	76.6
Tobacco (lbs)	18,916,012	21,407,497	13.2	38,410,965	79.4
Potatoes (bushels)	1,058,919	973,932	8.0	1,501,169	54.1
Butter (lbs)		3,806,160		5,265,295	38.3
Hay (tons)	110,836	157,956	42.5	191,744	21.4
Swine	421,520	352,941	-16.3	387,756	9.9
Sheep	262,909	177,902	-32.3	155,765	-12.4
Cattle	240,432	219,586	-8.7	253,241	15.3
Horses/Mules	93,954	81,328	-13.4	103,829	27.7

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers (Maryland), National Archives, Washington, D.C., (1840); 1850a:225-228; 1860a:72-73

Table 6. Slaves as a Percentage of Total Population in Maryland, South Carolina, and the South, 1790-1860

Year	Maryland	South Carolina	Southern States	Border States*	Lower States
1790	32.2	43.0	33.5	32.0	41.1
1800	30.9	42.3	32.7	30.8	40.3
1810	29.3	47.3	33.4	30.1	44.7
1820	36.4	51.4	34.0	29.6	45.6
1830	23.0	54.3	34.0	29.0	46.0
1840	19.1	55.0	34.0	26.7	46.0
1850	15.5	57.6	33.3	24.7	45.4
1860	12.7	57.2	32.3	22.3	44.8

*Includes Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, North Carolina, and Tennessee; remaining states in Lower South.

Source: Gray 1941, Vol. 2:656

Table 7. Slave Population as a Percentage of Total Population in the Five Counties of Southern Maryland, 1790-1860

Year	Anne Arundel	Calvert	Charles	Prince George's	St. Mary's	Maryland
1790	44.8	49.8	48.9	52.4	44.9	32.2
1800	43.1	49.4	49.9	57.5	46.7	30.9
1810	43.8	49.2	61.4	44.6	46.9	29.3
1820	37.9	45.4	57.1	55.3	46.6	26.4
1830	36.6	43.8	57.0	56.6	45.9	23.0
1840	33.2	45.2	57.3	54.4	43.6	19.1
1850	34.7	46.5	59.3	53.4	42.6	15.5
1860	30.7	44.1	58.4	53.5	43.0	12.7

Source: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce 1870c:36-37

Table 8. Racial Distribution of Population in Maryland, 1748-1860

Year	Total	Whites	% Total	Free Blacks	% Total	Slaves	% Total
1748	130,000	94,000	72.3	--	--	36,000	27.7
1755	150,168	107,208	71.4	1,817	1.2	41,143	27.4
1760	166,523	116,759	70.1	--	--	49,764	29.9
1770	199,827	140,110	70.1	--	--	59,717	29.9
1782	254,050	170,688	67.2	--	--	83,362	32.8
1790	319,728	208,649	65.3	8,043	2.5	103,036	32.2
1800	341,548	216,326	63.3	19,587	5.7	105,635	30.9
1810	380,546	235,117	61.8	33,927	8.9	111,502	29.3
1820	407,350	260,223	63.9	39,730	9.8	107,397	26.4
1830	447,040	291,108	65.1	52,938	11.8	102,994	23.0
1840	470,019	318,204	67.7	62,078	13.2	89,737	19.1
1850	583,034	417,943	71.7	74,723	12.8	90,368	15.5
1860	687,049	515,918	75.1	83,942	12.2	87,189	12.7

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1870c:36-37; Fisher 1852:25; Papenfuse and Coale 1982:37

Table 9. Agricultural Production in Prince George's County and in Maryland, 1840

Category	Maryland	Prince George's County	% of State
Tobacco (lbs)	18,916,012	9,259,423	48.9
Hay (tons)	110,836	2,618	2.4
Potatoes (bushels)	1,058,919	21,570	2.0
Corn (bushels)	8,470,165	507,266	6.0
Rye (bushels)	824,333	38,211	4.6
Oats (bushels)	3,579,950	107,070	3.0
Wheat (bushels)	3,511,433	80,147	2.3
Swine	421,520	24,210	5.7
Sheep	262,909	13,833	5.3
Cattle	240,432	10,482	4.4
Horses and Mules	93,954	4,648	4.9
Market Gardens ($)	133,197	3,480	2.6
Orchard Products ($)	114,339	1,777	1.6
Dairy Products ($)	466,558	7,710	1.7

Source: Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers, 1840: Maryland, National Archives, Washington, D. C.

Table 10. Agricultural Production in Prince George's County, 1840-1860

Category	1840	1850	1860
Tobacco (lbs)	9,259,423	8,380,851	13,446,550
Hay (tons)	2,618	5,557	6,328
Potatoes[1] (bushels)	21,570	51,503	30,936
Corn (bushels)	507,266	693,020	699,144
Rye (bushels)	38,211	18,491	24,234
Oats (bushels)	107,070	67,286	98,073
Wheat (bushels)	80,147	231,687	312,796
Swine	24,201	20,193	25,927
Sheep	13,833	11,650	8,828
Cattle	10,482	11,101	12,183
Horses and Mules	4,648	4,812	6,065
Market Gardens ($)	3,480	13,281	30,483
Orchard Products ($)	1,777	8,202	5,370

[1]Includes Irish and Sweet Potatoes

Source: Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufactures 1840: Maryland, National Archives, Washington, D. C.; Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce 1850a:225-228; 1860a:72-73, 203, 231.

Table 11. Agricultural Production in Prince George's County, by Districts, 1840

Category	Districts: 1 and 2	3	4	5	6
Tobacco (lbs)	1,433,250	4,113,363	2,411,512	1,210,100	91,198
Hay (tons)	522	1,108	226	357	406
Potatoes (bushels)	5,012	9,026	4,074	2,214	1,244
Corn (bushels)	60,438	246,177	94,258	87,620	18,733
Rye (bushels)	5,954	18,597	4,796	6,665	2,197
Oats (bushels)	16,884	55,444	18,693	12,819	3,230
Wheat (bushels)	10,415	32,178	16,414	17,378	3,762
Swine	4,092	9,484	5,082	4,471	1,072
Sheep	2,677	5,611	3,052	2,039	454
Cattle	2,117	2,345	2,794	2,660	566
Horses and Mules	1,040	1,185	1,132	1,034	257
Market Gardens ($)	0	0	490	2,990	0
Orchard Products ($)	1,242	120	0	415	0
Dairy Products ($)	4,590	1,920	1,055	145	0

Source: Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufactures 1840: Maryland, National Archives, Washington, D. C.

Table 12. Agricultural Production in 1850 Maryland, Prince George's County, and Spaldings District

Category	Maryland	Prince George's County	% State	Spaldings	% County
Improved Acres	2,797,905	191,553	6.8	11,199	5.8
Value of Farms	87,178,545	5,565,751	6.4	263,829	4.7
Value of Farm Implements	2,463,443	125,656	5.1	4,831	3.8
Value of Livestock	7,997,634	492,650	6.2	25,390	5.2
Value of Animals Slaughtered	1,954,800	103,351	5.3	5,048	4.9
Value of Orchard Products	164,051	8,202	5.0	622	7.6
Value of Market Gardens	200,869	13,281	6.6	2,861	21.5
Wheat (bushels)	4,494,680	231,687	5.2	7,863	3.4
Rye (bushels)	226,014	18,491	8.2	1,185	6.4
Corn (bushels)	10,749,858	693,020	6.4	28,975	4.2
Oats (bushels)	2,242,151	67,286	3.0	2,510	3.7
Tobacco (lbs)	21,407,497	8,380,851	39.1	109,000	1.3
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	764,939	47,458	6.2	4,646	9.8
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	208,993	4,045	1.9	101	2.5
Butter (lbs)	3,806,160	100,947	2.7	4,835	4.8
Hay (tons)	157,956	5,557	3.5	692	12.5

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers (Maryland), National Archives, Washington, D. C. 1850b:225-228; 1850: Prince George's County Manuscript Agriculture Census.

Table 13. Agricultural Production in 1860 Maryland, Prince George's County, and Spaldings District

Category	Maryland	Prince George's County	% State	Spaldings	% County
Improved Acres	3,002,267	182,468	6.1	10,274	5.6
Value of Farms	145,973,677	10,421,108	7.1	607,600	5.8
Value of Farm Implements	4,010,529	211,971	5.3	11,057	5.2
Value of Livestock	14,667,853	875,317	6.0	46,275	5.3
Value of Animals Slaughtered	2,801,510	90,603	3.2	1,557	1.7
Value of Orchard Products	252,196	5,370	2.1	3,010	56.1
Value of Market Gardens	530,221	30,483	5.7	9,290	30.5
Wheat (bushels)	6,103,480	312,796	5.1	7,032	2.2
Rye (bushels)	518,901	24,234	4.6	1,861	7.7
Corn (bushels)	13,444,922	699,144	5.2	28,750	4.1
Oats (bushels)	3,959,298	98,073	2.5	4,584	4.7
Tobacco (lbs)	38,410,965	13,446,550	35.0	152,200	1.1
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	1,264,429	29,974	2.4	2,083	6.9
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	236,740	962	0.4	0	0.0
Butter (lbs)	5,265,295	78,629	1.5	2,898	3.7
Hay (tons)	191,744	6,328	3.3	824	13.0

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers (Maryland), National Archives, Washington, D. C. 1860b:72-72, 203, 231; 1860: Prince George's County Manuscript Agriculture Census.

Table 14. Percentage Slave and Free Black or Black Population of Maryland and Prince George's County, 1790-1890

	MARYLAND			PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY		
Year	Slave	Free Black	Total	Slave	Free Black	Total
1790	32.2	2.5	34.7	52.4	7.7	60.1
1800	30.9	5.7	36.6	57.5	3.1	60.6
1810	29.3	8.9	38.2	44.6	23.9	68.5
1820	26.4	9.8	36.2	55.3	5.4	60.7
1830	23.0	11.8	34.8	56.5	5.9	62.5
1840	19.1	13.2	32.3	54.4	5.5	59.9
1850	15.5	12.8	28.3	53.4	5.3	58.7
1860	12.7	12.2	24.9	53.5	5.1	58.6
1870	--	--	22.5	--	--	46.3
1880	--	--	22.5	--	--	47.2
1890	--	--	20.7	--	--	43.0

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce 1870c:36-37; 1890a:415.

Table 15. Free Black Population of Maryland and Prince George's County, 1790-1860

Year	Maryland	Prince George's County	% State
1790	8,043	164	2.0
1800	19,587	648	3.3
1810	33,927	4,929	14.5
1820	39,730	1,096	2.8
1830	52,938	1,209	2.3
1840	62,078	1,080	1.7
1850	74,723	1,138	1.5
1860	83,942	1,198	1.4

Source: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce 1870c:36-37.

Table 16. Agricultural Production in Maryland, 1860-1880

Category	1860	% Change	1870	% Change	1880	% Change
Farms	25,244	15.5	27,000	7.0	40,517	50.1
Improved Acres	3,002,267	7.3	2,914,007	-2.9	3,342,700	14.7
Average Farm Acreage	192	-10.4	167	-13.0	126	-24.6
Value of Farms	145,973,677	67.4	170,369,684	16.7	165,503,341	-2.9
Value of Farm Implements	4,010,529	62.9	5,268,676	31.4	5,788,197	9.9
Value of Livestock	14,667,853	83.4	18,433,698	25.7	15,865,728	-13.9
Value of Animals Slaughtered	2,801,510	43.3	4,621,418	64.9	--	--
Value of Orchard Products	252,196	53.7	1,319,405	423.4	1,563,188	18.5
Value of Market Gardens	530,221	164.0	1,309,782	147.2	873,968	-33.3
Wheat (bushels)	6,103,480	35.8	5,773,408	-5.4	8,004,864	38.7
Rye (bushels)	518,901	129.6	307,089	-40.8	288,067	-6.2
Corn (bushels)	13,444,922	25.1	11,701,817	-13.0	15,968,533	36.5
Oats (bushels)	3,959,298	76.6	3,221,643	-18.6	1,794,872	-44.3
Tobacco (lbs)	38,410,965	79.4	15,785,339	-59.0	26,082,147	65.2
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	1,264,429	65.2	1,632,205	29.1	1,497,017	-8.3
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	236,740	13.4	218,706	-7.6	329,590	50.7
Butter (lbs)	5,265,295	38.3	5,014,729	-4.7	7,485,871	49.3
Hay (tons)	191,744	21.4	223,119	16.4	264,567	18.6
Swine	387,756	9.9	257,893	-33.5	335,408	30.1
Sheep	155,765	-12.4	129,697	-16.7	171,184	32.0
Cattle	253,241	15.3	215,359	-15.0	262,540	21.9
Horses and Mules	103,829	27.7	99,526	-3.8	130,352	31.0

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers (Maryland), National Archives, Washington, D. C. 1860a:72-73; 1870d:172-183, 354; 1880a:60-61, 119, 141, 156-157, 177, 192, 212, 228, 250-251, 283-284.

Table 17. Agricultural Production in Prince George's County 1850-1880

Category	1850	1860	1870	1880
Farms	885	1,070	835	1,689
Improved Acres	191,553	182,045	125,045	164,289
Value of Farms	5,565,751	10,421,108	7,358,111	6,849,702
Value of Farm Implements	125,656	211,971	159,659	199,475
Value of Livestock	492,650	875,317	659,620	597,890
Value of Animals Slaughtered	103,351	90,603	120,597	--
Value of Orchard Products	8,202	5,370	15,346	49,258
Value of Market Gardens	13,281	30,483	52,429	136,077
Value of Forest Products	--	--	25,189	75,990
Value of All Farm Products	--	--	1,340,947	1,252,617
Value of Fences	--	--	--	84,141
Value of Fertilizer	--	--	--	48,701
Wheat (bushels)	231,687	312,796	79,181	129,946
Rye (bushels)	18,491	24,234	23,849	17,041
Corn (bushels)	693,020	699,144	518,131	656,888
Oats (bushels)	67,286	98,073	57,411	37,395
Tobacco (lbs)	8,380,851	13,446,550	3,665,004	6,575,246
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	47,458	29,974	60,179	50,721
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	4,045	962	8,099	40,977
Butter (lbs)	100,947	78,629	69,658	126,358
Hay (tons)	5,557	6,328	6,536	5,269
Milk (gallons)	--	--	21,190	147,192

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers (Maryland), National Archives, Washington, D. C. 1850a:225-228; 1860a:72-73, 203, 231; 1870d:172-173, 354, 526-528, 672-674; 1880a:60-61, 119, 141, 156-157, 177, 192, 212, 228, 250-251, 283-284.

Table 18. Average Agricultural Production Per Farmer in Prince George's County, 1850-1880

Category	1850	1860	1870	1880
Farms	885	1,070	835	1,689
Improved Acres	216	171	150	97
Value of Farms[1]	6,431	9,739	8,812	4,055
Value of Farm Implements	--	198	191	118
Value of Livestock	--	818	790	354
Value of Animals Slaughtered	81	85	144	--
Value of Orchard Products	1	5	18	29
Value of Market Gardens	1	28	63	81
Value of Wages	--	--	591	--
Value of Forest Products	--	--	30	45
Value of All Farm Products	--	--	1,606	742
Value of Fences	--	--	--	50
Value of Fertilizer	--	--	--	29
Wheat (bushels)	262	292	95	77
Rye (bushels)[2]	97	23	29	10
Corn (bushels)	783	653	621	389
Oats (bushels)	--	92	69	22
Tobacco (lbs)	9,470	12,567	4,389	3,893
Irish Potatoes (bushels)[3]	58	28	72	30
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	--	1	10	24
Butter (lbs)	114	73	83	75
Hay (tons)	6	6	8	3
Milk (gallons)	--	--	25	87

[1]combines value of farms and farm implements in 1850
[2]combines quantity of rye and oats in 1850
[3]combines quantity of Irish and sweet potatoes in 1850

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers (Maryland), National Archives, Washington, D. C. 1850a:225-228; 1860a:72-73, 203, 231; 1870d:172-173, 354; 1880a:60-61, 119, 141, 156-157, 177, 192, 212, 228, 250-251, 283-284.

Table 19. Population of Prince George's County By Race, 1790-1890

Year	White	%	Slave	%	Free Black	%	Total
1790	10,004	46.9	11,176	52.4	164	7.7	21,344
1800	8,346	39.4	12,191	57.5	648	3.1	21,185
1810	6,471	31.4	9,189	44.6	4,929	23.9	20,589
1820	7,935	39.3	11,185	55.3	1,096	5.4	20,216
1830	7,687	37.5	11,585	56.6	1,209	5.9	20,481
1840	7,823	40.0	10,636	54.4	1,080	5.5	19,539
1850	8,901	41.3	11,510	53.4	1,138	5.3	21,549
1860	9,650	41.4	12,479	53.5	1,198	5.1	23,327
1870	11,358	53.7	--	--	9,780	46.3	21,138
1880	13,965	52.8	--	--	12,486	47.2	26,451
1890	14,867	57.0	--	--	11,210	43.0	26,080

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce 1870c:36-37; 1890a:415.

Table 20. Agricultural Production in Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts, 1850-1880

Category	Spaldings 1850	Spaldings 1860	Spaldings 1870	Oxon Hill 1880	Spaldings 1880
Farms	77	134	88	138	128
Improved Acres	11,199	10,274	8,270	6,531	5,263
Value of Farms	263,829	607,600	747,570	316,570	470,080
Value of Farm Implements	4,831	11,057	19,925	15,267	12,049
Value of Livestock	25,390	46,275	53,211	30,432	26,678
Value of Animals Slaughtered	5,048	1,557	7,746	--	--
Value of Orchard Products	622	3,010	3,003	4,220	11,173
Value of Market Gardens	2,861	9,290	14,363	36,475	15,986
Value of Wages	--	--	40,005	13,286	15,459
Value of Forest Products	--	--	9,179	2,325	3,281
Value of All Farm Products	--	--	100,498	41,890	67,178
Value of Fences	--	--	--	2,211	1,616
Value of Fertilizer	--	--	--	3,211	758
Wheat (bushels)	7,863	7,032	2,197	2,382	667
Rye (bushels)	1,185	1,861	2,638	369	1,134
Corn (bushels)	28,975	28,750	23,715	24,631	16,620
Oats (bushels)	2,510	4,584	3,830	1,199	1,145
Tobacco (lbs)	109,000	152,000	29,900	49,930	33,850
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	4,646	2,083	4,987	4,196	3,500
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	101	0	2,685	18,396	2,577
Butter (lbs)	4,835	2,898	7,310	10,116	10,591
Hay (tons)	692	824	1,060	533	385
Milk (gallons)	--	--	5,920	--	28,740

Sources: 1850-1880 Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Censuses

Table 21. Agricultural Production in Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts as a Percentage of Production in Prince George's County, 1850-1880

Category	Spaldings 1850	Spaldings 1860	Spaldings 1870	Oxon Hill 1880	Spaldings 1880	Combined 1880
Farms	8.7	12.5	10.5	8.2	7.6	15.8
Improved Acres	5.8	5.6	6.6	4.0	3.2	7.2
Value of Farms	4.7	5.8	10.2	4.6	6.9	11.5
Value of Farm Implements	3.8	5.2	12.5	7.7	6.0	13.7
Value of Livestock	5.2	5.3	8.1	5.1	4.5	9.6
Value of Animals Slaughtered	4.9	1.7	6.4	--	--	--
Value of Orchard Products	7.6	56.1	19.6	8.6	22.7	31.3
Value of Market Gardens	21.5	30.5	27.4	26.8	11.7	38.5
Value of Wages	--	--	8.1	--	--	--
Value of Forest Products	--	--	36.4	3.1	4.7	7.8
Value of All Farm Products	--	--	7.5	3.3	5.4	8.7
Value of Fences	--	--	--	2.6	1.9	4.5
Value of Fertilizer	--	--	--	6.6	1.6	8.2
Wheat (bushels)	3.4	2.2	2.8	1.8	0.5	2.3
Rye (bushels)	6.4	7.7	11.1	2.1	6.7	8.8
Corn (bushels)	4.2	4.1	4.6	3.7	2.5	6.2
Oats (bushels)	3.7	4.7	6.7	3.2	3.1	6.3
Tobacco (lbs)	1.3	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.5	1.3
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	9.8	6.9	8.3	8.3	6.9	15.2
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	2.5	0.0	33.2	44.9	6.3	51.2
Butter (lbs)	4.8	3.7	10.5	8.0	8.4	16.4
Hay (tons)	12.5	13.0	16.2	10.0	7.3	17.3
Milk (gallons)	--	--	27.9	0.0	19.5	19.5

Sources: 1850-1880 Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Censuses

Table 22. Number and Percent of All Farmers Who Indicate Values in Production Categories, Spaldings and Oxon Hill District, 1850-1880

Category	Spaldings 1850 77 Farms #	%	Spaldings 1860 134 Farms #	%	Spaldings 1870 88 Farms #	%
Improved Acres	77	100.0	133	99.3	88	100.0
Value of Farms	77	100.0	134	100.0	88	100.0
Value of Farm Implements	77	100.0	103	76.9	88	100.0
Value of Livestock	73	94.8	106	79.1	88	100.0
Value of Animals Slaughtered	72	93.5	15	11.2	60	68.2
Value of Orchard Products	12	15.6	7	5.2	23	26.1
Value of Market Gardens	15	19.5	20	14.9	44	50.0
Value of Wages	--	--	--	--	72	81.8
Value of Forest Products	--	--	--	--	27	30.7
Value of All Farm Products	--	--	--	--	83	94.3
Value of Fences	--	--	--	--	--	--
Value of Fertilizer	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wheat (bushels)	44	57.1	36	26.9	18	20.5
Rye (bushels)	35	45.5	33	24.6	33	37.5
Corn (bushels)	71	92.2	99	73.9	69	78.4
Oats (bushels)	28	36.4	37	27.6	37	42.0
Tobacco (lbs)	16	20.8	22	16.4	9	10.2
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	55	71.4	24	17.9	40	45.5
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	9	11.7	0	0.0	22	25.0
Butter (lbs)	38	49.4	13	9.7	44	50.0
Hay (tons)	51	66.2	37	27.6	63	71.6
Milk (gallons)	--	--	--	--	3	3.4

Sources: 1850-1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Censuses.

Table 22. (continued)

Category	Spaldings 1880 138 Farms #	%	Spaldings 1880 128 Farms #	%	Spaldings 1880 266 Farms #	%
Improved Acres	138	100.0	128	100.0	266	100.0
Value of Farms	138	100.0	128	100.0	266	100.0
Value of Farm Implements	132	95.7	115	89.8	247	92.9
Value of Livestock	135	97.8	124	96.9	259	97.4
Value of Animals Slaughtered	--	--	--	--	--	--
Value of Orchard Products	42	30.4	78	60.9	120	45.1
Value of Market Gardens	108	78.3	58	45.3	166	62.4
Value of Wages	72	50.7	62	48.4	134	50.4
Value of Forest Products	64	46.4	48	37.5	112	42.1
Value of All Farm Products	124	89.9	112	87.5	236	88.7
Value of Fences	36	26.1	9	7.0	45	16.9
Value of Fertilizer	55	39.9	14	10.9	69	25.9
Wheat (bushels)	32	23.2	7	5.5	39	14.7
Rye (bushels)	11	8.0	28	21.9	39	14.7
Corn (bushels)	106	76.8	80	62.5	186	69.9
Oats (bushels)	9	6.5	24	18.8	33	12.4
Tobacco (lbs)	19	13.8	13	10.2	32	12.0
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	59	42.8	62	48.4	121	45.5
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	58	42.0	35	27.3	93	35.0
Butter (lbs)	76	55.1	53	41.4	129	48.5
Hay (tons)	49	35.5	49	38.3	98	36.8
Milk (gallons)	0	0.0	5	3.9	5	1.9

Sources: 1850-1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Censuses.

Table 23. Average Agricultural Production by All Farmers, Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts, 1850-1880

Category	Spaldings 1850	Spaldings 1860	Spaldings 1870	Oxon Hill 1880	Spaldings 1880	Combined 1880
Farms	77	134	88	138	128	266
Improved Acres	145	77	94	47	41	44
Value of Farms	3,489	4,534	8,495	2,294	3,673	2,957
Value of Farm Implements	63	83	226	111	94	103
Value of Livestock	--	345	605	221	208	215
Value of Animals Slaughtered	66	12	88	--	--	--
Value of Orchard Products	8	22	34	31	87	58
Value of Market Gardens	37	69	163	264	125	197
Value of Wages	--	--	455	96	121	108
Value of Forest Products	--	--	104	17	28	22
Value of All Farm Products	--	--	1,142	304	525	410
Value of Fences	--	--	--	16	13	14
Value of Fertilizer	--	--	--	23	6	15
Wheat (bushels)	102	52	25	17	5	11
Rye (bushels)[1]	48	14	30	3	9	6
Corn (bushels)	376	215	269	178	130	155
Oats (bushels)	--	34	44	9	9	9
Tobacco (lbs)	1,416	1,135	340	362	264	315
Irish Potatoes (bushels)[2]	61	16	57	30	27	29
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	--	0	31	133	20	79
Butter (lbs)	63	22	83	73	83	78
Hay (tons)	9	6	12	4	3	3
Milk (gallons)	--	--	67	0	225	108

[1]combines quantity of rye and oats in 1850
[2]combines quantity of Irish and sweet potatoes in 1850

Sources: 1850-1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Censuses.

Table 24. Average and Median Agricultural Production Per Producing Farmer (Owners and Tenants) in Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts, 1850-1880

Category	Spaldings 1850		Spaldings 1860		Spaldings 1870		Oxon Hill 1880		Spaldings 1880	
	Avg.	Med.	Avg.	Med.	Avg.	Med.	Avg.	Med.	Avg.	Med.
Improved Acres	149	115	77	40	94	70	47	30	48	30
Value of Farms	3,471	1,900	4,534	2,000	9,000	5,000	2,294	1,500	3,673	2,000
Value of Farm Implements	65	40	107	50	229	150	116	50	94	75
Value of Livestock	348	260	437	275	605	375	225	150	215	125
Value of Animals Slaughtered	70	46	104	100	129	70	--	--	--	--
Value of Orchard Products	34	30	430	100	131	50	100	50	143	25
Value of Market Gardens	191	100	465	100	326	250	338	200	276	200
Value of Wages	--	--	--	--	556	300	185	150	249	180
Value of Forest Products	--	--	--	--	340	150	36	20	75	30
Value of All Farm Products	--	--	--	--	1,211	868	338	200	600	500
Value of Fences	--	--	--	--	--	--	61	30	180	50
Value of Fertilizer	--	--	--	--	--	--	58	50	54	30
Wheat (bushels)	179	57	195	83	122	100	74	60	95	55
Rye (bushels)	34	30	56	30	80	40	34	28	41	40
Corn (bushels)	408	350	290	200	344	180	232	150	208	125
Oats (bushels)	90	55	124	75	104	75	133	75	48	30
Tobacco (lbs)	6,813	4,000	6,918	5,000	3,322	2,400	2,628	2,200	2,604	2,000
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	84	40	87	50	125	75	71	50	56	39
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	11	7	0	0	122	50	317	150	58	40
Butter (lbs)	127	100	223	100	166	150	133	100	200	104
Hay (tons)	14	8	22	10	17	7	11	5	8	4
Milk (gallons)	--	--	--	--	1,973	1,200	0	0	5,748	5,475

Sources: 1850-1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Censuses.

Table 25. Percentage of State or County Agricultural Production Compared to Percentage of State or County Population: Prince George's County, Spaldings District, and Oxon Hill District, 1880

Category	P. George's Co. pop. 26,451	Rank in State	Oxon Hill pop. 1,289	Spaldings pop.1,671	Combined pop. 2,960
Population	2.8	10	4.9	6.3	11.2
Total Acres	5.3	5	3.8	4.3	8.1
Improved Acres	4.9	7	4.0	3.2	7.2
Value of Farms	4.1	8	4.6	6.9	11.5
Value of Farm Implements	3.4	13	7.7	6.0	13.7
Value of Livestock	3.8	12	5.1	4.5	9.6
Value of Orchard Products	3.2	10	8.6	22.7	31.3
Value of Market Gardens	15.6	2	26.8	11.7	38.5
Value of Forest Products	6.2	6	3.1	4.7	7.8
Value of All Farm Products	4.3	11	3.3	5.4	8.7
Value of Fences	7.2	3	2.6	1.9	4.5
Value of Fertilizer	1.7	17	6.6	1.6	8.2
Wheat (bushels)	1.6	15	1.8	0.5	2.3
Rye (bushels)	5.9	7	2.1	6.7	8.8
Corn (bushels)	4.1	12	3.7	2.5	6.2
Oats (bushels)	2.1	14	3.2	3.1	6.3
Tobacco (lbs)	25.2	1	0.8	0.5	1.3
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	3.4	12	8.3	6.9	15.2
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	12.4	1	44.9	6.3	51.2
Butter (lbs)	1.7	14	8.0	8.4	16.4
Hay (tons)	2.0	12	10.1	7.3	17.4
Milk (gallons)	3.1	6	0.0	19.5	14.5

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1880a:60-61, 119, 141, 156-157, 177, 192, 212, 228, 250-251, 283-284; 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 26. Average Farm Size by Total and by Improved Acreage, 1850-1880: Maryland, Prince George's County, and Spaldings and Oxon Hill Districts

Area	1850		1860		1870		1880	
	Total	Imprvd	Total	Imprvd	Total	Imprvd	Total	Imprvd
Maryland	212 (21,860 farms)	128	192 (25,244 farms)	119	167 (27,000 farms)	108	126 (40,517 farms)	83
Prince George's Co.	321 (885 farms)	216	263 (1,071 farms)	171	243 (835 farms)	150	159 (1,689 farms)	97
Spaldings	237 (77 farms)	145	133 (134 farms)	77	173 (88 farms)	94	90 (128 farms)	41
Oxon Hill	--	--	--	--	--	--	74 (138 farms)	47

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce 1850a:225-228; 1860a:72-73, 203, 231; 1870d:172-173, 354; 1880a:119; 1850-1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Censuses.

Table 27. Average Farm Size for Owners and Tenants, 1880, Prince George's County, Oxon Hill, and Spaldings Districts (percentages of next highest category in parentheses)

Category	Maryland		County		Oxon Hill		Spaldings	
Farms	40,517		1,689	(4.2)	138	(8.2)	128	(7.6)
Average Total Acres	126		159		74		90	
Average Improved Acres	72		97		47		48	
Owners	27,978	(69.1)	1,203	(71.2)	97	(70.3)	97	(75.8)
Average Total Acres	--		--		76		90	
Average Improved Acres	--		--		49		41	
Tenants	12,539	(30.9)	486	(28.8)	41	(29.7)	31	(24.2)
Average Total Acres	--		--		68		89	
Average Improved Acres	--		--		44		42	
Rental Tenants	3,878	(30.9)	211	(43.4)	36	(87.8)	29	(93.5)
Average Total Acres	--		--		73		93	
Average Improved Acres	--		--		47		43	
Share Tenants	8,661	(69.1)	275	(56.6)	5	(12.2)	2	(6.5)
Average Total Acres	--		--		31		29	
Average Improved Acres	--		--		29		25	

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1880a:28-29, 60-61, 119; 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 28. Average Agricultural Production by All Farmers and Tenants, Maryland, Prince George's County, and Oxon Hill District, 1880

Category	Maryland (40,517 farms)	Prince George's County (1,689 farms)	Oxon Hill Farmers (138 farms)	Oxon Hill Tenants (41 farms)
Total Acres	126	159	74	68
Improved Acres	83	97	47	44
Value of Farms	4,037	4,055	2,294	1,868
Value of Farm Implements	143	118	111	75
Value of Livestock	392	354	221	174
Value of Orchard Products	39	29	31	15
Value of Market Gardens	22	81	264	318
Value of Wages	--	--	96	71
Value of Forest Products	30	45	17	8
Value of All Farm Products	712	742	304	256
Value of Fences	29	50	16	5
Value of Fertilizer	70	29	23	19
Wheat (bushels)	198	77	17	8
Rye (bushels)	7	10	3	4
Corn (bushels)	394	389	178	189
Oats (bushels)	44	22	9	19
Tobacco (lbs)	644	3,893	362	295
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	37	30	30	35
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	8	24	133	210
Butter (lbs)	185	75	73	37
Hay (tons)	7	3	4	3
Milk (gallons)	117	87	0	0

Sources: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Schedule of Mines, Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufacturers (Maryland), National Archives, Washington, D.C. 1880a:28-29, 60-61, 119; 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 29. Average Agricultural Production by Oxon Hill Farmers and Tenants, 1880

Category	Farmers (138)		Tenants (41)	
	Avg/Farmer	Avg/Producer	Avg/Tenant	Avg/Producer
Total Acres	74	74	67	67
Improved Acres	47	47	44	41
Value of Farms	2,294	2,294	1,868	1,868
Value of Farm Implements	111	116	75	79
Value of Livestock	221	225	174	183
Value of Orchard Products	31	100	15	76
Value of Market Gardens	264	338	318	408
Value of Wages	96	185	71	162
Value of Forest Products	17	36	8	20
Value of All Farm Products	304	338	256	276
Value of Fences	16	61	5	24
Value of Fertilizer	23	58	19	49
Wheat (bushels)	17	74	5	31
Rye (bushels)	3	34	4	48
Corn (bushels)	178	232	189	248
Oats (bushels)	9	133	19	159
Tobacco (lbs)	362	2,628	295	3,025
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	30	71	35	89
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	133	317	210	479
Butter (lbs)	73	133	37	89
Hay (tons)	4	11	3	17
Milk (gallons)	0	0	0	0

Source: 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 30. Average Agricultural Production by Spaldings Farmers and Tenants, 1880

Category	Farmers (128) Avg/Farmer	Farmers (128) Avg/Producer	Tenants (31) Avg/Tenant	Tenants (31) Avg/Producer
Total Acres	90	90	89	89
Improved Acres	41	41	42	43
Value of Farms	3,673	3,673	3,290	3,290
Value of Farm Implements	94	94	91	108
Value of Livestock	208	215	195	209
Value of Orchard Products	87	143	56	97
Value of Market Gardens	125	276	170	528
Value of Wages	121	249	117	278
Value of Forest Products	28	75	9	56
Value of All Farm Products	525	600	633	755
Value of Fences	13	180	9	90
Value of Fertilizer	6	54	11	69
Wheat (bushels)	5	95	1	21
Rye (bushels)	9	41	7	36
Corn (bushels)	130	208	127	197
Oats (bushels)	9	48	13	45
Tobacco (lbs)	264	2,604	8	250
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	27	56	38	73
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	20	58	40	155
Butter (lbs)	83	200	41	143
Hay (tons)	3	8	3	10
Milk (gallons)	0	0	927	5,748

Source: 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 31. Average Agricultural Production by Farm Owners and Tenants and by Producing Farmers and Tenants, Oxon Hill and Spalding Districts, 1880

Category	Oxon Hill (97) Owner	Oxon Hill (97) Prod.	Oxon Hill (41) Tenant	Oxon Hill (41) Prod.	Spaldings (97) Owner	Spaldings (97) Prod.	Spaldings (31) Tenant	Spaldings (31) Prod.
Total Acres	77	77	67	67	90	90	89	89
Improved Acres	48	48	44	44	41	41	42	42
Value of Farms	2,474	2,474	1,868	1,868	3,794	3,794	3,290	3,290
Value of Farm Implements	126	131	75	79	95	104	91	108
Value of Livestock	240	243	174	183	213	217	195	209
Value of Orchard Products	37	106	15	76	97	157	56	97
Value of Market Gardens	241	308	318	408	110	223	170	528
Value of Wages	107	192	71	162	122	243	117	278
Value of Forest Products	21	84	5	24	14	224	9	90
Value of All Farm Products	324	365	256	276	490	553	633	755
Value of Fences	21	84	5	24	14	224	9	90
Value of Fertilizer	25	62	19	49	4	46	11	69
Wheat (bushels)	23	84	4	48	9	42	7	36
Rye (bushels)	2	28	4	48	9	42	7	36
Corn (bushels)	174	228	189	248	131	211	127	197
Oats (bushels)	4	101	19	159	8	49	13	45
Tobacco (lbs)	390	2,522	295	3,025	346	2,800	8	250
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	29	64	35	89	24	51	38	73
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	101	244	210	479	14	50	40	155
Butter (lbs)	89	146	37	89	96	222	41	143
Hay (tons)	4	10	3	17	3	7	3	10
Milk (gallons)	0	0	0	0	0	0	927	5,748

Source: 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 32. Racial Distribution of Farmers and Farm Laborers in Oxon Hill District, 1880

Race	Farmers	%	Farm Laborers	%
White	104	73.8	75	47.8
Black	28	19.9	68	43.3
Mulatto	9	6.4	14	8.9
Total	141	100.1	157	100.0

Source: 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural and Population Censuses.

Table 33. Racial Distribution of Farmers and Farm Laborers in Spaldings District, 1880

Race	Farmers	%	Farm Laborers	%
White	111	95.7	143	56.3
Black	2	1.7	86	33.9
Mulatto	3	2.6	25	9.8
Total	116	100.0	254	100.0

Source: 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural and Population Censuses.

Table 34. Agricultural Production by Thomas Berry Compared to Average and Median Production by All Producing Farmers (Owners and Tenants), Spaldings District, 1850

Category	Berry	Average	Median
Total Acres	887	244	--
Improved Acres	587	149	115
Value of Farms	40,000	3,471	1,900
Value of Farm Implements	300	65	40
Value of Livestock	1,729	348	260
Value of Animals Slaughtered	45	70	46
Value of Orchard Products	75	34	30
Value of Market Gardens	10	191	100
Wheat (bushels)	1,300	179	57
Rye (bushels)	0	34	30
Corn (bushels)	3,000	408	350
Oats (bushels)	0	90	55
Tobacco (lbs)	0	6,813	4,000
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	50	84	40
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	0	11	7
Butter (lbs)	0	127	100
Hay (tons)	1	14	8
Horses	3	4	--
Mules/Asses	8	2	--
Oxen	8	4	--
Milch Cows	10	4	--
Other Cattle	0	5	--
Sheep	0	20	--
Swine	100	14	--

Source: 1850: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 35. Agricultural Production by Thomas Berry at Oxon Hill manor, Spaldings District, and at Ellersbie, Queen Anne's District, 1860

Category	Berry Oxon Hill	Average Oxon Hill	Median Oxon Hill	Berry Queen Anne's
Total Acres	1,600	133	--	400
Improved Acres	700	77	40	350
Value of Farms	60,000	4,534	2,000	28,000
Value of Farm Implements	1,000	107	50	600
Value of Livestock	3,000	437	275	2,200
Value of Animals Slaughtered	0	104	100	0
Value of Orchard Products	0	430	100	0
Value of Market Gardens	0	465	100	0
Wheat (bushels)	1,400	195	83	600
Rye (bushels)	0	56	30	0
Corn (bushels)	2,500	290	200	2,000
Oats (bushels)	300	124	75	0
Tobacco (lbs)	4,000	6,918	5,000	60,000
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	0	87	50	100
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	0	0	0	0
Butter (lbs)	0	223	100	175
Hay (tons)	8	22	10	0
Horses	8	3	2	16
Mules/Asses	7	3	2	0
Oxen	8	3	2	8
Milch Cows	7	3	2	8
Other Cattle	14	4	3	4
Sheep	0	19	19	53
Swine	100	12	9	0

Source: 1860: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 36. Agricultural Production by Thomas E. Berry at Ellersbie, Queen Anne's District, 1850

Category	Production Levels
Total Acres	432
Improved Acres	350
Value of Farms	17,280
Value of Farm Implements	500
Value of Livestock	1,886
Value of Animals Slaughtered	416
Value of Orchard Products	0
Value of Market Gardens	0
Wheat (bushels)	1,000
Rye (bushels)	50
Corn (bushels)	3,650
Oats (bushels)	100
Tobacco (lbs)	50,000
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	50
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	10
Butter (lbs)	400
Hay (tons)	5
Horses	8
Mules/Asses	9
Oxen	12
Milch Cows	8
Other Cattle	2
Sheep	30
Swine	60

Source: 1850: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

Table 37. Agricultural Production by T. Owen Berry at Oxon Hill Manor, Spaldings District, 1870

Category	Berry	Average	Median
Total Acres	2,150	173	--
Improved Acres	800	94	70
Value of Farms	100,000	9,000	5,000
Value of Farm Implements	700	229	150
Value of Livestock	3,000	605	375
Value of Animals Slaughtered	2,000	129	70
Value of Orchard Products	0	131	50
Value of Market Gardens	1,000	326	250
Value of Wages	3,500	556	300
Value of Forest Products	600	340	150
Value of All Farm Products	9,500	1,211	868
Wheat (bushels)	500	122	100
Rye (bushels)	100	80	40
Corn (bushels)	2,500	344	180
Oats (bushels)	500	104	75
Tobacco (lbs.)	0	3,322	2,400
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	300	166	150
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	1,000	122	50
Butter (lbs.)	300	166	150
Hay (tons)	30	17	7
Milk (gallons)	0	1,973	1,200
Horses	18	3	--
Mules/Asses	6	3	--
Milch Cows	6	3	--
Other Cattle	12	3	--
Sheep	150	37	--
Swine	50	8	--

Source: 1870: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census

Table 38. Agricultural Production by Oxon Hill Manor Tenants and Possible Tenants (average)*, with Oxon Hill District Average and Median, 1880

Category	Streeks	Bowie	Lanham	Tenants	Average	Median
Total Acres	160	50	225	37	74	48
Improved Acres	160	35	150	30	47	30
Value of Farms	3,500	1,000	8,000	1,063	2,294	1,500
Value of Farm Implements	200	50	300	81	116	50
Value of Livestock	800	100	300	81	116	50
Value of Orchard Products	0	0	0	6	100	50
Value of Market Gardens	1,000	100	2,000	531	338	200
Value of Wages	600	0	400	46	185	150
Value of Forest Products	0	10	24	4	36	20
Value of All Farm Products	700	250	400	122	338	200
Value of Fences	0	0	0	0	61	30
Value of Fertilizer	50	15	60	14	58	50
Wheat (bushels)	0	0	0	0	74	60
Rye (bushels)	0	0	0	0	34	28
Corn (bushels)	900	125	705	129	232	150
Oats (bushels)	0	0	600	22	133	75
Tobacco (lbs)	0	2,800	0	0	2,628	2,200
Irish Potatoes (bushels)	300	60	0	20	71	50
Sweet Potatoes (bushels)	1,200	1,200	1,200	285	317	150
Butter (lbs)	50	50	100	61	133	100
Hay (tons)	0	0	0	0	11	5
Milk (gallons)	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Averages for Nalley, George Streeks, Pane, Mallor, Monroe, Butler, Silas Tolbert, and Sydney Tolbert

Source: 1880: Prince George's County Manuscript Agricultural Census.

APPENDIX C

pounds eat	%
.2	.00
.4	.00
	.13
	.07
7	99.9

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, H. I. "Campaign Maps, Army of the Potomac, Yorktown to Williamsburg, Map 1.", September, 1862.

Bailyn, Bernard, "Politics and Social Structure in Virginia," in James M. Smith, ed., *Seventeenth Century America,* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1959.

Barka, Norman F., "The Kiln and Ceramics of the Poor Potter of Yorktown: A Preliminary Report," in Ian M. G. Quimby, ed., *Ceramics in America,* University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1973.

Barber, Michael, "The Vertebrate Fauna from a Late Eighteenth Century Well: The Bray Plantation, Kingsmill, Virginia," ms. Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown, Virginia, 1976.

Beebe, Lewis, *Ms Journal, 1776–1801.* Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, n.d.

Bell, Muriel and Malcolm Bell, Jr., *Drums and Shadows,* University of Georgia Press, Athens, Georgia, 1940.

Betts, E. M., *Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book,* The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1944.

Beverly, Robert, *The History and Present State of Virginia,* Louis B. Wright, ed., University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1947.

Billings, Warren W., *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century,* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1975.

Boyd, Julian P., ed., *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson,* Vol. I, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1950.

Breeden, James O., ed., *Advice among Masters,* Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1980.

Byrd, William, *The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover,* Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling, eds., The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia, 1941.

Calver, William Louis and Reginald Pelham Bolton, *History Written with Pick and Shovel,* New York Historical Society, New York, 1950.

Carr, Lois Green and Lorena S. Walsh, "Inventories and Analysis of Wealth and Consumption Patterns in St. Mary's County, Maryland, 1658–1777." Paper presented at the Newberry Library Conference on Quantitative and Social Science Approaches in Early American History, n.d.

Carson, Barbara and Gary Carson, "Styles and Standards of Living in Southern Maryland, 1670–1752." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, Atlanta, Georgia, 1976.

Carson, Cary, *et al.,* "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies," *Winterthur Portfolio,* Vol. 16, nos. 2/3, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1981.

Chappell, Edward, "Slave Housing," *The Interpreter,* Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1982.

Clemens, Paul G. E., *The Atlantic Economy and Maryland's Eastern Shore,* Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1980.

Crozier, William Armstrong, *Virginia Heraldica,* Southern Book Co., Baltimore, Maryland, 1953.

Davis, Richard Beale, ed., *William Fitzhugh and his Chesapeake World, 1676–1701,* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1963.

Deetz, James, *In Small Things Forgotten,* Anchor Press, New York, 1977.

Egloff, Keith, *Colonial Plantation Hoes of Tidewater, Virginia,* Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1980.

Evans, George Ewart, *The Pattern Under the Plow,* Faber & Faber, London, 1966.

Genovese, Eugene D., *Roll Jordan Roll,* Pantheon Books, New York, 1974.

Glassie, Henry, *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia,* The University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1975.

Goodwin, Mary R. M., "Kingsmill Plantation, James City County," ms. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1958.

Greene, Jack P., ed., *The Diary of Colonel Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, 1752–1778,* University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1966.

Harper, Margaret Newbold, "Life in Virginia by a Yankee Teacher," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography,* Vol. 64, No. 2, Richmond, Virginia, 1956.

Harwood, Humphrey, "Ledger B. Folio 67," ms. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, n.d.

Hening, William Walter, *Statutes at Large,* Samuel Shepherd, Richmond, Virginia, 1820.

Henrico County Miscellaneous Court Records, Vol. I.

Hiden, Martha W., *Adventurers in Purse and Person,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1956.

Hudgins, Carter L., "The King's Realm: An Archaeological and Historical Study of Plantation Life at Robert Carter's Corotoman," Master's Thesis, Wake Forest University, Winston–Salem, North Carolina, 1981.

Isaac, Rhys, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740–1790,* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1982.

James City County Tax Lists, 1768–1769.

Jefferson, Thomas, *Notes on the State of Virginia,* John Stockdale, London, 1787.

Kelso, William M., "An Interim Report on the Historical Archaeology at Kingsmill, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975," ms. Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown, Virginia.

Kelso, William M., "A Report on the Archaeological Excavations at Monticello, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1979–1983," ms. Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1984.

Kelso, William M., "Archaeological Survey of the Log Slave Quarter at Bremo Recess," ms. Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1982.

Kelso, William M., "Excavation of a Late Seventeenth Century Domestic Refuse Pit Near Lightfoot, James City County, Virginia, 1964–65," *The Archaeological Society of Virginia Quarterly Bulletin,* Vol. 20, No. 4, 1966.

Kelso, William M., "More Excavations at Lightfoot," *The Archaeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin,* Vol. 22, No. 2, 1967.

Kelso, William M., "Rescue Archaeology on the James," *Archaeology,* September/October, 1979.

Kingsbury, Susan M., ed., *Records of the Virginia Company of London,* Government Printing Office, Washington, 1935.

Kukla, Jon, "Political Institutions in Virginia, 1619–1660," Master's Thesis, University of Toronto, 1979.

Liancourt, Duke De La Rochfoucault, *Travels Through the United States of North America,* London, 1800.

Luccketti, Nicholas, "North Quarter Salvage Excavation, Interim Report," ms. Virginia Historical Landmarks Commission, Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown, Virginia, 1979.

McClure, James P., "Littletown Plantation, 1700–1745," Master's Thesis, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1977.

McDaniel, George W., *Hearth and Home,* Temple University Press, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1982.

McIlwaine, H. R., ed., *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia,* The Colonial Press, Richmond, Virginia, 1924.

Mercer, Eric, *The English Vernacular House,* H. M. Stationery Office, London, 1975.

Miller, Henry M., "Pettus and Utopia: A Comparison of the Faunal Remains from Two Late Seventeenth Century Virginia Households," ms. St. Mary's City Commission, St. Mary's City, Maryland, 1978.

Miller, Henry M., "Pettus, Utopia, Bray, Kingsmill Tenement, and Kingsmill Plantation Faunal Analysis Preliminary Statements," Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown, Virginia, n.d.

Miller, Randall M., *Dear Master, Letters of a Slave Family,* Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1978.

Montgomery, Charles F., *A History of American Pewter,* Praeger, New York, 1973.

Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom,* Norton, New York, 1975.

Mullin, Gerald W., *Flight and Rebellion,* Oxford University Press, London, New York, 1972.

Neiman, Fraser D., *The Manner House Before Stratford,* Robert E. Lee Memorial Association, Stratford, Virginia, 1980.

Newman, Eric P., "Coinage for Colonial Virginia," *Numismatic Notes and Monographs,* (The American Numismatic Society, 1956), p. 36.

Noël Hume, Ivor, *A Guide to the Artifacts of Colonial America,* Knopf, New York, 1970.

Noël Hume, Ivor, "Excavations at Tutter's Neck in James City County, Virginia, 1960–61," *Contributions from the Museum of History and Technology,* Washington, D.C., 1966.

Noël Hume, Ivor, *The Wells of Williamsburg: Colonial Time Capsules,* Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1969.

Nugent, Nell, *Cavaliers and Pioneers, Abstracts of the Virginia Land Patents, 1623–1666,* Dietz Printing Co., Richmond, 1929–1931.

Otto, John Solomon, "Artifacts and Status Differences: A Comparison of Planter, Overseer and Slave Sites from Cannon's Point Plantation (1794–1861), St. Simon's Island, Georgia, an Antebellum Plantation," in Stanley South, ed., *Research Strategies in Historical Archaeology,* Academic Press, New York, 1977.

Otto, John Solomon, "Race and Class on Antebellum Plantations," Robert L. Schuyler, ed., *Archaeological Perspectives on Ethnicity in America,* Baywood Publishing Company, New York, 1980.

Outlaw, Alain C., "Excavations at the Maine Site, James City County, Virginia," ms. Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Research for Archaeology, Yorktown, Virginia, 1979.

Outlaw, Merry A., Beverly A. Bogley, and Alain C. Outlaw, "Rich Man, Poor Man: Status Definition of Two Seventeenth Century Ceramic Assemblages from Kingsmill," ms. Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, Research Center for Archaeology, Yorktown, Virginia, 1977.

Percy, George, "Observations Gathered Out of a Discourse of the Plantation of the Southern Colony in Virginia by the English, 1606," David B. Quinn, ed., University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1967.

Perdue, Charles, Jr., *et al., Weevils in the Wheat: Interviews with Virginia Ex-Slaves,* University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1976.

Perdue, Martin C., "Nineteenth Century and Late Eighteenth Century Slave Dwellings," ms. Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1981.

Simcoe, Lt. Colonel, *A Journal of the Operation of the Queen's Rangers from the End of the Year 1777 to the Conclusion of the Late American War,* Exeter, 1787.

Smart, Ann Morgan, "The Role of Pewter as "Missing Artifact": Evidence from Late Eighteenth Century Probate Inventories, Albemarle County, Virginia," ms. Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1984.

Smith, James M., *Archaeology of Yorke Village and the First and Second Parish Churches, Yorktown, Va.,* College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1978.

Smyth, J. F. D., *Tour in the United States of America,* London, 1794.

South, Stanley, *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology,* Academic Press, New York, 1977.

Stacey, Pocahontas H., *The Pettus Family,* Washington, D.C., N.P. 1957.

Stanard, W. G., *The Colonial Virginia Register,* Geneological Publishing Co., Baltimore, Maryland, 1965.

Stephenson, Mary A., "A Record of the Bray Family, 1658–ca. 1800," ms. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1963.

Swem, Earl Gregg, "Brothers of the Spade," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society,* Philadelphia, April, 1948.

Tate, Thad W., *The Negro in Eighteenth Century Williamsburg,* Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1965.

Tatum, William, *Essay of the Culture and Commerce of Tobacco,* London, 1800.

Upton, Dell, "Slave Housing in Eighteenth Century Virginia," ms. Report to the Department of Social and Cultural History, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1982.

Upton, Dell, "Venacular Domestic Architecture in Eighteenth Century Virginia," *Winterthur Portfolio,* Vol. 17, No. 1, University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Vince, John, *Wells and Water Supply,* Aylesbury, England, 1978.

The Virginia Gazette.

The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. III, Richmond, Virginia, 1895–1896.

Vlach, John Michael, *The Afro-American Tradition in Decorative Arts,* The Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, Ohio, 1978.

Waterman, Thomas Tileston, *The Mansions of Virginia, 1706–1776,* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1946.

Wells, Ann Camille, "Kingsmill Plantation, A Cultural Analysis," Master's Thesis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1976.

Whiffen, Marcus, *The Eighteenth Century Houses of Williamsburg,* Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, 1960.

York County Will Book Number 14.